

VOLUME XXIX

NUMBER 1

THE
HARVARD
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Library of the
PACIFIC UNITARIAN SCHOOL
FOR THE MINISTRY
Berkeley, California

JANUARY, 1936

AN APPROACH TO IGNATIUS *James Moffatt* 1

THE GILD OF ZEUS HYPYSTOS
Colin Roberts, Theodore C. Skeat, Arthur Darby Nock 39

NOTES:

THE MEANING OF HOAITETTAI IN JUSTIN, I, APOI. 65.1
Cyril C. Richardson 89



CAMBRIDGE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1936

Issued Quarterly

\$3.00 a Year

Single Numbers \$1.00

THE HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Issued quarterly by the Faculty of Divinity in
Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Editorial Committee

ARTHUR D. NOCK

WILLARD L. SPERRY
J. A. C. F. AUER

GEORGE LA PIANA
HENRY J. CADBURY

The *Harvard Theological Review* is maintained on the foundation established under the will of Mildred Everett, daughter of Charles Carroll Everett, Bussey Professor of Theology in Harvard University, 1869-1900, and Dean of the Faculty of Divinity, 1878-1900.

The scope of the Review embraces theology, ethics, the history and philosophy of religion, and cognate subjects. It aims to publish investigations, discussions, and reviews which contribute to the enlargement of knowledge or the advance of thought.

Remittances and communications on business matters should be addressed to the *Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts*.

PUBLISHED BY THE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
PUBLISHERS OF THE LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

*Entered as second-class mail matter January 2, 1908, at the post-office at Boston, Mass.
under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.*

*Acceptance for mailing at special postage rate provided for by Section 1103, Act of
October 3, 1917, authorized on July 31, 1918.*

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XXIX

JANUARY, 1936

NUMBER 1

AN APPROACH TO IGNATIUS

JAMES MOFFATT

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK

RECENT studies of Ignatius the bishop of Antioch have been fresh and varied, upon the whole. Some of his theological ideas have been reconsidered, as for example his conceptions of the Trinity by Jules Lebreton (*Recherches de Science Religieuse*, 1925, 97 f., 393 f.) and Loofs (*Theophilus von Antiochien adversus Marcionem*, 1930, 194 f.). His relation to the gnostic movement occupies H. Schlier's *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatiusbriefen* (1929), and emerges in Lietzmann's *Geschichte der Alten Kirche*, I (1932, 251 f.) and Walter Bauer's *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (1934, 65 f.). The psychological interest crops up in Dr. Streeter's ingenious account of his attitude towards church-orders (*The Primitive Church*, 1929), while wider surveys are furnished by Dr. F. A. Schilling (*Mysticism of Ignatius of Antioch*, 1932) and Dr. Cyril Richardson (*The Christianity of Ignatius of Antioch*, 1935). These monographs represent an advance upon the old-fashioned practice of grouping Ignatius among the so-called 'apostolic fathers,' or of estimating him in the wake of a 'mystical succession' headed by the apostles Paul and John. There is also some recognition that one must fairly allow for a wider Christian interest than happens to be directly reflected in these vivid, occasional letters of the bishop; fascinating and independent as they are, it is clear that they imply more than they actually urge.

However, from whatever angle they are approached, there is a modest, minor discipline which, I think, should be faced, and that is a preliminary re-arrangement of their literary structure. Not that there are displacements in the documents, as for example in the Corinthian correspondence of Paul. But something ought to be done in order to render the reading of them more lucid than it is at present in ordinary editions. Ever

since critical skill started to disentangle the authentic seven from the matrix of the longer recension, the material has been divided up into numbered paragraphs, and these are no more happy than some of the chapter divisions in the Bible. Indeed the arrangement tends now and then to obscure the flow or rather the successive rushes of the writer's mind. Thus (to give only one or two specimens), in the Ephesian letter, xi and xii, xiv and xv, ought not to be sharply separated; there is a break in the text but not in the thought of ii and iii within the Magnesian letter; there is no severance between i and ii in the Roman letter, where again v ought to start with οὐχ ὡς Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος in iv; ii-iv in the Philadelphian letter form a single paragraph, the new one starting with καὶ τοὺς προφῆτας δὲ ἀγαπῶμεν in the middle of v; in the Smyrniote letter, i-iii are a natural unity, and there is no break between vi and vii, while the last two sentences of vii introduce viii (down to λατρεύει).

Although at the outset an edition like that of Nicolas Vedel (Geneva, 1623) had no divisions at all, paragraphing had to come, for the sake of convenience in referring to the contents. The misfortune was that it was done in a rough-and-ready fashion; so haphazard was the method that it proves often a handicap rather than a help to study, by introducing artificial divisions which blur the vivid, jerky movement of the writer's mind. The fact is, while there is nothing formal about these letters, they had a prototype; as Ignatius did write with the general outline and literary form of Paul's epistles at the back of his mind, ἐν ἀποστολικῷ χαρακτῆρι, his letters might well have been thrown into chapter-and-verse form by editors. This was actually tried at one time. In an edition of archbishop Wake's version (1693),¹ for example, I find the Trallian letter arranged

¹ Other references in the notes (which are merely occasional, not complete) are to some editors and translators of the text, from Voss (1646) and Cotelier (1672), Pearson and Smith (1709), Whiston (in his *Primitive Christianity*, 1711), Frey (1742) and Russell (1746), to Temple Chevallier (1833), Bunsen (1847), Petermann (1849), Hefele (4th ed. 1855), Dressel (1857), Jacobson (4th ed. 1863), H. Scholz (1865), Mayer (1869), Zahn (1876), C. H. Hoole (1885), Lightfoot (2nd ed. 1889), Bruston (in his *Ignace d'Antioche*, 1897), Funk (2nd ed. 1901), Hilgenfeld (1902), Krueger (in Hennecke's *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, 1904), Lake (1912), Franz Zeller (1918), J. H. Srawley (3rd ed. 1919), Walter Bauer (1920), Bihlmeyer (1924), Delafosse (1927), and Lelong (2nd ed. 1927).

in three chapters; the first includes what is now covered by the first five paragraphs (with the inscription as the first verse), the second has vi–xi, and the third xii–xiii. So far as I can ascertain, however, this practice failed to supplant the conventional paragraph arrangement. And in any case such a chapter-and-verse form reproduced the same artificial assignment of the material. It is true that some scholars did detect false divisions; thus Hefele and Mayer protested that in the Trallian letter the beginning of iv continues the argument of iii uninterruptedly, and Hilgenfeld printed his text of the letter as Wake had done — that is, in three paragraphs. It is now high time to consider the advantages of breaking away from this conventional division into numbered paragraphs, and such is one aim of the present study. In order to show how the natural shifts and pauses of the writer's mind may be brought out, I choose as a specimen the Trallian letter, with a view to indicate the benefits of re-setting the text, and also, by translating it, to suggest that the Greek of Ignatius requires to be read in the light of contemporary Hellenistic usage. It is only thus that his exact aims and his shading of general conceptions, as well as his characteristic twists and turns of thought, even his niceties of diction,² can be duly appreciated. Literary criticism of this kind has something to contribute to modern research into the foreground and the background of the epistles.

I

The text underlying the following translation corresponds in the main to that printed in most modern editions, but at several points the problem of disentangling the original from the longer

² Some reflect the Syriac temperament as expressed in the Odes of Solomon, for example. But this is not to be pressed. Thus the medical metaphor in *φάρμακον* (vi) undoubtedly recalls the Syriac identification of healing with life-giving power (see Baudissin's *Adonis und Esmun*, 258, 341, 396 f.); yet a writer like Menander happens to use it as freely as Ignatius, and it extends from the cult of Isis to another Egyptian source in the *Hermetica*. Trallians, however, supplies two specimens of the edged paradox which Ignatius particularly loved, both in connection with *πράοτης* (*ἐν ᾗ καταλύεται ὁ ἄρχων* iv, and *ἡ δὲ πράοτης δύναμις* iii). It is a feature of his style. 'Ignatius elocutione utitur artificiosa et quaesita, aspera et concisa,' H. Reinhold remarks, in his *De Graecitate Patrum Apostolorum* (p. 19), although this is not fully just to the bishop.

Greek recension might well be reconsidered. Thus, in the inscription, the church is said to enjoy peace or bliss *ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ πνεύματι τῷ πάθει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, i.e. 'peace temporal and spiritual (or, outward and inward) through the passion of Jesus Christ.' But, in view of viii and Smyrn. xii, *πνεύματι* in this reading of the longer recension seems less probable than the strongly attested and daring *αἵματι* (so Voss, Cotelier, Frey, Dressel, Jacobson, Wake, Russell, Chevallier, Scholz, Mayer, Petermann, Bunsen, Hilgenfeld, Hefele, and Hoole). There is a similar confusion between *πνεύματι* and *αἵματι* in Smyrn. iii, though the evidence is less in favour of *αἵματι* there. The following (*καὶ*) *τῷ πάθει* (which is absent from the Coptic and the Armenian versions) sounds like a gloss, although 'passion' after 'flesh and blood' may well be one of the redundant phrases which Ignatius liked to employ for the sake of emphasis. Then, in iii, the Latin version of Ussher's codex Montacutianus reveals *τοὺς διακόνους ὡς ἐντολήν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*³ *καὶ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ὡς Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ὄντα υἱὸν τοῦ πατρός*, which, in the light of Smyrn. viii (*διακόνους ὡς θεοῦ ἐντολήν*), looks Ignatian. May not this reading in whole or in part be preferable (Voss, Cotelier, Frey, Smith, Bunsen, Dressel, Scholz, Mayer, and Jacobson)? Again, the proposal to read *κάκει* (G) instead of *κακῇ* (in vi), which after Voss proved popular (Frey, Whiston, Smith, Pearson, Russell, Cureton, Jacobson, etc.), has at any rate the *παρ' αὐτὰ ἀποθνήσκει* of xi in its favour. On the other hand, *ἐδόξασα εὐρῶν ὑμᾶς* (i) appears more original than the longer text's *ἔδοξα εὐρῶν* (or *εὐρέιν*), which Voss, Frey, Wake, Chevallier, Whiston, Mayer, Jacobson, Dressel, Russell, Hefele, and Hoole retained; 'I seemed to find you' is flat, compared to 'I gave God thanks that I found you.' Also, to substitute *ὑμᾶς* for *αὐτοὺς* at the end of ii (with Voss, Bunsen, and Pearson), as if Ignatius were warning the laity against listening to scandals about deacons, is to miss the point; he is still insisting on the high, exacting calling of deacons in 'the mysteries of Jesus Christ,' i.e. on their spiritual functions, not

³ Not 'as appointed by Jesus Christ' but 'as Jesus Christ's Command or law,' authoritative for maintaining Christian unity. With characteristic freedom Ignatius applies this term to the bishop himself (Trall. xiii). By *ἐντολή* in this connexion he means whatever regulates and determines the divine fellowship of the Church; even the presbyters get a similar title (Magn. ii *ὡς νόμῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*).

only as they take part in the ministry of the Word (see Philad. xi) but as agents of charity, where such scandals could readily arise. This reminiscence of I Corinthians (ὡς ὑπηρετας Χριστοῦ καὶ οἰκονόμους μυστηρίων θεοῦ, 4, 1), by the way, is one of many proofs that Ignatius had the epistle almost by heart.

At four places the text is badly broken (in ii, iii, vi, and ix). Though the general sense is fairly clear, such lacunae call for fresh attention, even if they relate to details. Fortunately the Trallian letter is included in the new fragments from the Coptic version of the shorter recension, which Wessely⁴ printed in 1913, and part of it (iv-v) had been added to the Syriac version of Romans, as published by Cureton in his *Corpus Ignatianum* (1849).

The letter is not particularly significant for investigations like those of Dr. Schlier. It does not even touch the Jewish side of the heresies or heresy combatted by Ignatius. It has no dramatic reminiscence like Philad. vii, no passage like the Star vision (in Ephes. xix), and no passionate outbursts upon martyrdom such as are met in Rom. iv-v. But it does raise some crucial issues, apart from the conception of the ministry. (a) Thus, the presence of *πλήρωμα* in the inscription starts the question, what does this term mean in Ignatius? Is it coloured by gnostic speculation, and if so, is it only to the same extent as in Paul? Does the phrase here signify 'in the fulness of blessing,'⁵ or (describing the church) 'in the fulness (of your membership, your complete position as the Society of God),' if not 'in the Fulness' (the perfect sphere of divine revelation)? The last is the sense of the term in the inscription to the Ephesian letter, but there it is made explicit; it does not follow that Ignatius employed *πλήρωμα* invariably in the same sense. (b) The letter also contains one of the rare allusions to Christians as *μέλη* of Christ, though in a compressed sentence (xi), which means, 'He calls you. Yes, for no Head can exist without its

⁴ Sitzungsberichte der kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien (vol. 172, part iv).

⁵ If *Theophorus* carried the sense of *Deo plenus* or God-inspired (see C. H. Turner in *Studies in Early Church History*, 27), this would tally with such an interpretation, especially in the light of v below, and of the Coptic version ('in the fulness of the apostolic manner').

members in the Body. Only, the true members are those who cling to the true Cross; no one who leaves that out, on any plea of being spiritual,⁶ can possibly be a fruitful branch of the real Christ.⁷ The allusion becomes clear in the light of Ephes. xi and Smyrn. i, where the Body is definitely mentioned, instead of being presupposed as here in a hurried, staccato sentence, which also opens up into (c) one of the three allusions to unity with God, τοῦ θεοῦ ἔνωσιν ἐπαγγελλομένον,⁸ ὃ ἐστὶν αὐτός. As in vii and even more explicitly in Ephes. v, union between Christians and God implies the Church, in which the divine unity of Father and Son is embodied. Ignatius has no place for Paul's idea of the indwelling Spirit in this connexion; he stands nearer to the Johannine conception. The divine unity is a reality within the Church (Philad. viii) which adheres to the gospel of the Incarnation as reproduced and guaranteed for Christians through the threefold ministry. He can speak of 'the will of God and of Jesus Christ' (Trall. i); he can even declare that 'God is himself unity,' in the Johannine sense of possessing absolute concord in his nature ('I and the Father are one' in purpose of will; also 17.1 f., where this unity of Father and Son implies unity in the fellowship). When Ignatius declares that this concord⁹ of Christians with God is 'promised' by God

⁶ This is the point of ix and of καταξιοπιστευόμενοι in vi ('claiming credence,' as in Polybius xii. 17, 11). It is confirmed by the paraphrase of the Coptic version, οὐκ ἄξιό εἰσι τοῦ πιστέειν αὐτοῖς, which is prefixed to οἱ . . . παρεμπλέκουσιν.

⁷ There is a partial parallel in the seventeenth Ode of Solomon, where the Redeemer cries, 'I sowed my fruit in hearts of men . . . who were gathered to me and saved, because they were to me as my own members, and I was their Head.' But this collocation of καρπός and the confession of Jesus Christ as ἀληθῶς incarnate, in Ignatius (Smyrn. i), is not derived from the Odes.

⁸ It is the only place where Ignatius alludes to God 'promising.' Usually this does carry with it a reference to the future life (as in Clem. Rom. 26 and 2 Clem. 10 and 11). Here the association of it with the Passion implies the Resurrection, as in Smyrn. i, where unity is similarly presented. What Ignatius carried across Asia was the 'pageant of Christ's bleeding heart,' not of his own; he may be suggesting that the divine call to Christians is not only bound up with the Passion but guaranteed thereby and ratified already, for ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι might denote this ('announcing') rather than 'promising.' Or, in modern phrasing, the union of Christians who have no cross-purposes is 'implicit' in the union of Christ to the Father, i.e., in God's full nature and purpose manifested through the Incarnation, Passion, and Resurrection.

⁹ Abstract terms like ἔνωσις, ἐνότης, δμόνοια, πλήρωμα, and οἰκονομία become curi-

himself, he seems to hint that the fellowship of mutual love, rooted in loyalty to the Cross, and expressed through dutiful obedience to the sacred ministry, is an *οἰκονομία* divinely planned, being inherent in the divine mind and nature. It is an obscure passage, but this interpretation seems more consonant with the general position of Ignatius than to suppose, with Zeller, that the words refer to a martyr reaching full union with the deity on the 'birthday' of his death, or to read the phrase (with Smith and Delafosse) as 'God who is himself Christ.' So far as style goes, the phrase recalls a not uncommon turn of semi-mystical reflection at the close of a sentence, a few words being added in apposition. As it happens, there are several specimens of this in the contemporary *Hermetica*, e.g. in ii (end) τὸ ἀγαθὸν . . . τοῦ θεοῦ ἀχώριστον, ὡς αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς ὄν, in xi (end) ἀεὶ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ, αὐτὸς ὢν ὁ ποιεῖ, and in xiii. 15 τοῦ ἐνὸς πατρὸς, ὁ κἀγώ. This is merely parallelism, however; there is no clear proof that Ignatius was indebted either to the *Hermetica* or to the *Odes of Solomon*.

The other letters are lit up with some vivid, imaginative metaphors, like that of the coinage in *Magnesians* (v) or of the building in *Ephesians* (ix). *Trallians* does not re-echo even the favourite musical metaphor in any of its applications (*Ephesians* iv, *Romans* ii, *Philadelphians* i), but once (in vi) it strikes a dramatic note in the use of medical metaphor. Already Ignatius had compared the errorists to stealthy, snapping curs, whose bite was dangerous (*Ephes.* vii), but now he is reversing a common metaphor in order to make his point against insidious separatists. *Lucretius* began (i. 941 f.) by explaining pleasantly that he proposed to use poetry for the sake of getting people to assimilate his philosophy, just as doctors induced a child to swallow an unpleasant potion by rubbing the edge of the cup with sweet honey —

deceptaque non capiatur,
sed potius tali pacto recreata valescat.

ously alive and glowing in Ignatius, who fuses them with his dominating conviction of God's personal will and love (e.g. in *Smyrn.* xii, *Philad.* vii, *Ephes.* iv and xviii). Thus the union of Christians with God is realized realistically through participation in the personality (flesh and blood) of Christ, as mediated by the eucharist. The new context re-sets such gnostic terms.

Tasso echoed the idea in the opening lines of *La Gerusalemme Liberata* —

così all' egro fanciul porgiamo aspersi
di soave licor gli orli del vaso;
succhi amari ingannato intanto ei beve,
e dall' inganno suo vita riceve.

Ignatius compares the dissenting or docetic teaching, with its *dulcis memoria* of a Jesus Christ who had no *πάθος*, to the adroit practice of poisoners who got their fatal drug or drink accepted by sweetening it surreptitiously. The text of the passage is indeed far from being clear; the reading *καὶ τὸν ἰόν* (in the longer recension) has suggested restorations of the original such as *καὶ ἰοῖς* (Voss, Chevallier, Petermann) or *καὶ ἰῶ* (Lightfoot).¹⁰ But, whatever the exact wording may have been, the notion of poison is plainly indicated. The really striking feature is not the use of *φάρμακον* as a term for moral or philosophical instruction — that occurs in other writers of the age, notably in Epictetus (iii. 21, 20 and iii. 24, 80, besides iv. 8, 31); it is the grim turn given to the metaphor of truth as the medicine of the soul. The religious philosophy which denied that episcopacy was essential to the Church or which lifted Christ above all suffering in the effort to present him as truly divine might be plausible, but it was the death of any deluded adherent! So Ignatius sternly warns the Trallians. Docetic or not, this movement had no validity for him. Validity or sound Christianity meant negatively, 'No bishop, no church; no church, no sacraments; no sacraments (especially the eucharist),¹¹ no *φάρμακον ἀφθαρσίας* or union with the living Lord.'¹² And the end of this pseudo-evangelicalism,

¹⁰ Which Harnack pronounced to be 'a very happy conjecture' (Expositor, third series, ii, 407).

¹¹ So deeply does he feel brotherly love to be the essential expression of life within the catholic Church that he calls eucharistic worship *ἀγάπην ποιεῖν* (Smyrn. viii). Love in the Trallian letter is the distinctive feature of churches (iii, xiii) and of individuals (vi, xii). See note below on viii.

¹² This is the point of the subsequent allusion to 'adhering inseparably to Jesus Christ' (vii, *ἀχωρίστους*). Except the Armenian version, the authorities prefix *θεοῦ*, which, with Von der Goltz (Texte und Untersuchungen, 1894, iii. 25) and Krüger, I regard as a pious gloss. Ignatius might well have written it ('from our God, Jesus Christ,' Wake), but not here.

however attractive and pleasant it might seem to pious individualists and ecclesiastical upstarts, was τὸ ἀποθανεῖν,¹³ not τὸ ὑγιαίνειν.

Again, the allusion to *θυσιαστήριον* in connexion with worship and the eucharistic sacrament (in vii) recalls the similar metaphor in Ephes. v ('unless one is within the sanctuary, he lacks the bread of God,' i.e. the divine blessing and provision for the soul), but it is presented to the Trallians with a special emphasis. Metaphorically, *θυσιαστήριον* means the Christian congregation or People of God duly gathered for worship under its appointed clergy; it is the inner precinct of the Christian Altar, where the Lord imparts the substance and the vital energy¹⁴ of the gospel to true Christians. In some real sense, which Ignatius does not define, the eucharist denotes sacrifice.¹⁵ But he does appear to hint that those who broke away from the catholic rite were called 'puritans' or 'the pure.' The language used about them here is stronger than in Magn. iv (οὐκ εὐσυνείδητοι). 'Inside the sanctuary one is pure (*καθαρός*), outside the sanctuary one is impure; that is, anyone who takes any action apart from the bishop,¹⁶ the presbytery, and the

¹³ It has been argued that Ignatius here draws upon the 38th of the Odes of Solomon (see the edition by Harris and Mingana ii, 42 f., and De Zwaan in the American Journal of Theology, 1911, 617 f.), where wrong teaching mingled with truth is compared to drugs in sweetened wine. But the translation of the Ode is too precarious to support any such rendering. The metaphor is coined by Ignatius, and its first echo is in Irenaeus (i. 27.4).

¹⁴ This is the force of what he says as he goes on to call faith (ὃ ἐστὶν σὰρξ τοῦ κυρίου) and love (ὃ ἐστὶν αἷμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) in viii. The latter is brotherly love, what others (though never Ignatius) called *φιλαδελφία*. These were the two supreme factors of the Christian fellowship, as is already noted in the Pastoral Epistles, and Ignatius insists that they were only possible for those who adhered to the worship of the Incarnation as enshrined in the eucharist or love-feast, under the regular bishop.

¹⁵ *θυσιαστήριον* was the enclosure in which an altar stood, as distinct from the outer court. Ignatius never calls the eucharistic rite sacrificial, but he probably meant that the redemptive death of Jesus Christ, which he sometimes calls 'his blood' (Philad. inscription), was the central truth of the gospel, and was somehow commemorated in the eucharist — very much as the writer to the Hebrews could say that we Christians *ἐχομεν θυσιαστήριον* (13, 10) of our own.

¹⁶ Newman's *Apologia pro Vita Sua* (chapter ii) provides a modern illustration. After explaining that when he began his Tracts for the Times, the epistles of Ignatius were one of his main inspirations, he adds, 'I loved to act as feeling myself in my Bishop's sight, as if it were the sight of God. . . . What to me was

deacons has not a pure conscience.' There is no need to cast about for some liturgical usage in order to explain *καθαρός συνειδήσει*. Ignatius was familiar with the 'pure conscience' of the Pastoral Epistles (I Tim. 3, 9 and 2 Tim. 1, 3). He may indeed be using *ὁ καθαρὸς* in the sense of *profanus*. But the peculiarly definite use of *καθαρός* in this connexion rather points to some sectarian nickname, for Ignatius never uses the term elsewhere of persons.

Though less agitated and disjointed than Philadelphians, Trallians suggests that the abruptness of style and the jerky composition of the letters were due to more than temperament. The conditions in which he wrote have to be taken into account. He cannot have had much privacy or leisure. Chained to his guards, he was never without interruptions; he must have been one of those letter-writers who suffer from what Professor Saintsbury called 'circumstances and circum-standers.' Even the friendly visits of sympathizing friends at Smyrna would break in upon his time. It is only in letters like Ephesians and Romans that one feels Ignatius is in command of a certain freedom to think consecutively. As a rule he had to write or to dictate his missives under pressure, as best he could; they must have been thrown off hurriedly, as he was exposed to invading discomforts and incessant interruptions. The wonder is that they are as coherent as they are. This factor should be reckoned in any fair historical estimate of their composition. Textual corruption does not entirely explain their spurts and sudden checks. One has the impression, even in reading Trallians, that he was not able to do much more than set down one or two salient points, with his mind full of competing interests and distracted by talk around him. It must have been hard to concentrate upon a given subject, even with a local bishop at his elbow suggesting what seemed to be the most timely topics for pastoral direction.

When he wrote to the Trallian as well as to the Philadelphian Christians, he was evidently impressed by the fear lest the talka-

jure divino was the voice of my Bishop in his own person. . . . My duty to him was my point of honour; his disapprobation was the one thing which I could not bear.'

tive, eloquent dissenters might throw into the shadow the quieter features of their bishop's character; the absence of overbearing self-assertiveness and loquacity is praised deliberately, to counteract any disparagement of him. Ignatius singles out, for this reason, the good temper of Polybius. He not only presses the quality of gentleness upon members, as usual, but singles it out for the first time as a shining episcopal virtue, seeing in Polybius, as he afterwards did in Polykarp of Smyrna, one who was much more than an official. When he declares that the bishop's *πραότης* is a *δύναμις*, he means not so much a 'miracle' (Lake) as a 'power' (see iv and Philad. i) of influence.

'Let gentleness my strong enforcement be.'

The letter shows how the bishop's example touched Ignatius himself, and also how keenly he felt the contrast between it and the prophetic spirits who had so much to say about God; it served to point some of his pastoral counsels for the local church, even although he commended them generously and generally. As he had told the Ephesians (ii) and the Magnesians (ii), he told the Trallians that he 'saw' their fine friendliness or goodwill in the person of their unassuming bishop, who 'represented' them in no merely official sense of the word. Words like *ἀποδεξάμενος τὴν κατὰ θεὸν εὐνοίαν* may indeed imply that they had forwarded a donation of food or money to him; now and then *εὐνοία* has this sense, as for example in a well-known letter of Epicurus. But the likelihood is that he simply hailed the loyal, hearty spirit of the group, as voiced by Polybius, feeling that he had much in common with Christians who *ἐν ὑπομονῇ* were quietly true to Christian principles and mindful of a martyr like himself.

The probability that Polybius could not count upon the presbyters in every case to uphold his authority (see note on iii), is likely to be the explanation of the singular¹⁷ place assigned to the *διάκονοι* (in ii-iii) as compared with the presbyters. Technically the *διάκονοι* were supposed to aid both bishop and

¹⁷ Polykarp, in writing to the Philippians (v, vi) copies this, but adds specific directions for the presbyters.

presbyters (see Magn. ii, where the ideal deacon ὑποτάσσεται τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὡς χάριτι θεοῦ καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ὡς νόμῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), but their duties tended to attach them with special closeness to the bishop. Bishop and deacon drew together as presbyters and deacons rarely did. Besides, Ignatius would realize that there was less chance of διάκονοι coming into rivalry with the ἐπίσκοπος. It was on the part of the πρεσβύτεροι, to whom the ἐπίσκοπος originally belonged, that the claims of the latter were apt to be resented, since the episcopal authority trenched upon their position. Any jealousy or friction was likely to be the work of the πρεσβυτέριον. This consideration helps to explain two particular points in the Ignatian letters. One is the unwonted warmth of language in recognizing the διάκονοι. Ignatius calls them his σύνδουλοι (Smyrn. xii, Philad. iv), and refers to one or two of them individually with obvious affection, like Burrhus of Ephesus, Zotion of Magnesia, and Philo the Cilician. The only place in which he uses the term γλυκὺς in this sense is in connexion with 'my very dear deacons' (Magn. vi). Behind all this lies a grateful, shrewd recognition of their support to the new prestige of the ἐπίσκοπος. The other point, which is allied to this, comes up in the unique attention paid to the διάκονοι in Trallians (ii, iii), where they are singled out for careful notice, far more than the presbyters. Indeed they are actually compared to Jesus Christ. This is because the bishop is compared to the Father, and as they have been discussed next to him, Ignatius does not hesitate to rank them as Jesus Christ ranked in the divine order of service. It is an exaggerated phrase, but not more so than, for example, the counsel to the Smyrniotes, 'follow the bishop, all of you, as Jesus Christ follows the Father' (viii); even when he definitely puts the διάκονοι in the third place (as in Magn. vi), he can speak of them as 'entrusted with the ministry of Jesus Christ.' These hyperbolic terms about the diaconate in Trallians and elsewhere do not imply that in calling deacons his 'fellow-servants' Ignatius meant 'co-deacons' literally.¹⁸ It was not that he intended to define his own position in the Church as a διάκονος, nor to express his great humility, nor simply because Paul had called

¹⁸ So e.g. Bruston (op. cit., 30 f.).

Εραφρας ἀγαπητὸς σύνδουλος and Tychicus ἀγαπητὸς ἀδελφὸς καὶ πιστὸς διάκονος καὶ σύνδουλος ἐν κυρίῳ (Coloss. 1, 7 and 4, 7). What all this language suggests is the intimate associations between an ἐπίσκοπος and his henchmen the διάκονοι, particularly when there was any risk or trace of local disaffection on the part of presbyters. It has indeed been supposed that Ignatius always assumes 'that the presbyters and deacons were in complete harmony with the bishop and will in all things act with him.'¹⁹ He does like to assume this. He even asserts now and then that such is the actual state of affairs. But in the churches of Asia, at any rate, we have only to read between the lines to discover that he was finding difficulties with more than the laity. As the century went on, history was to prove that the movement towards mono-episcopacy was not a case of some weak generalisation being pushed by a strong personality. But meantime, at this early stage, matters were far from being favourable, even in some of the churches which he addressed. Often the man who says, 'I feel sure,' and says it not insincerely, is not sure; at least, he is not quite so sure as he would like to be, perhaps not so sure as he would like others to think that he is. In the case of the presbyters at a church like Tralles or Smyrna, there are some indications that it was a few of the presbyters, not simply of the laity, who required to be brought into line with the new development. The anti-episcopal challenge evidently came from men of 'position'²⁰ in both communities. Writing from Smyrna, where there was some local tension of this kind, Ignatius allows his concern to sharpen his words to Tralles.

¹⁹ Streeter (op. cit., 170).

²⁰ The phrase τόπος μηδένα φυνσιούτω (in Smyrn. vi) implies that rank or position in the church was one qualification of those who were conducting separatist conventicles. I cannot overhear, as Bauer does (op. cit., 73 f.), an allusion to a gnostic anti-bishop here, but rather a reference to presbyters who were developing on lines of their own, as in the inscription of Polykarp's letter to the Philippians the bishop speaks in the name of himself 'and of his presbyters' at Smyrna, οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ πρεσβύτεροι, where (like the Latin *meum*, as Professor Mackail observes on Aeneid i. 675) σύν means 'on his side,' not 'beside him' (as though all the local presbyters could be reckoned true to the bishop). The anticipations of evil in the last days, according to the contemporary Ascensio Isaiae (iii. 23), include an appearance of 'those who love office, though they lack wisdom' and of 'lawless presbyters.'

This is corroborated by a slight but perceptible difference in the writer's tone as he refers to presbyters. In sending off several letters at once, Ignatius naturally used the same or similar phrases. Anyone who is familiar with literary criticism understands how inevitable this is; Cicero's letters illustrate it frequently. But Ignatius had also a delicate sense of what each church required or deserved, and this emerges in his allusions to presbyters. In the Trallian letter they receive no hearty word, as they do in the other letters from Smyrna, where he hails the Ephesian presbytery as *ἀξιονόμαστον, τοῦ θεοῦ ἄξιον*, attuned to the *ἐπίσκοπος* like strings to a harp, and the Magnesian presbytery as an *ἀξιοπλόκος πνευματικὸς στέφανος*. Even at Smyrna the presbytery was *θεοπρεπές*. Surely it is singular that at Tralles the presbytery²¹ lacks any such exalted, honorific title. Not that this would justify us in supposing that there was trouble at Tralles as yet. But when it is remembered that only the bishop appeared from Tralles, whereas Ephesus sent a deputation consisting of bishop, a deacon, and two laymen, while Magnesia sent bishop, a deacon, and two presbyters, we suspect that the presbyters at Tralles were not quite so good colleagues as they were elsewhere, or as Ignatius would have liked them to be. The fact that he hails the church as *εἰρηνευούση* is not decisive against this hypothesis, especially if we read *ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ αἵματι* in its wake, for the primary reference is to the peace of fellowship with God enjoyed by those who were truly saved by the Blood.²²

The point may seem trifling, but it is one of the questions which prove how necessary it is to study each of the letters individually, even although they do present a collective view of what Ignatius believed and encountered. This underlying consciousness of the local situation explains several emphases

²¹ He never speaks of an individual presbyter as he does of individual deacons, but always of the *πρεσβύτεροι* or *πρεσβυτέριον* collectively as a unity and authority. The contents of the Epistle of the Apostles are a 'revelation for' them as something similar (i) to the *συνέδριον* or *σύνδεσμος* of Trall. iii; Wajnberg renders the Ethiopic noun by *collegium* (Texte und Untersuchungen, 1919, 25).

²² The background is not simply that of passages like Rom. 5, 1 f. (*ἐχωμεν εἰρήνην πρὸς τὸν θεόν . . . δικαιωθέντες ἐν τῷ αἵματι Χριστοῦ*) or Col. 1, 20 (*εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ*), but of Clem. Roman. ii (*τὰ παθήματα αὐτοῦ ἦν πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ὧμων. οὕτως εἰρήνη βαθεῖα καὶ λιπαρὰ ἐδόδοτο πᾶσιν κτλ.*).

and omissions in the letters. And incidentally it raises a cognate point. For, while it is debated whether Ignatius had in mind two hostile fronts of heresy or only one, it should also be asked, whether in dealing with the tendencies towards separatism he was thinking exclusively of gnostic or docetic parties. May not the divisive elements have been due as much to an insubordinate, refractory spirit in the laity and the presbyters? Here, as in any political group, it is not simply differences of opinion that split men but also personal grievances, private ambitions, and self-willed assertion on the part of individuals. Diotrophes ὁ φιλοπρωτεύων (3 John 9) and the presbyters who are warned in 1 Peter against slackness, mercenary aims, and the domineering temper, were Asiatics of an earlier generation who were making their office a menace to peace in the Church but who apparently did not share heretical opinions. When we read the letters of Ignatius, we should bear in mind that such factors must have entered into any anti-episcopal movement as well as deliberate heresy. But, even so, it remains a problem, what did he mean by αἵρεσις? In Trall. vi, as in Ephes. vi, the only two places where it occurs, the primary reference is to anti-episcopal action; the term has still an untechnical sense. Yet in both passages there is a hint that this action implied some novel teaching about the person of Christ, as we might expect from the classical usage of the word; αἵρεσις denoted a group based upon certain philosophic or religious ideas, held as against others. When Christianity began to use the term, it passed before long from the sense of factiousness to that of a dissenting party which sought a fresh basis for fellowship and worship, other than that of the ἐκκλησία. Ignatius reflects the first stage of this transition. If we retain the literal rendering 'heresy,' it must be with the qualification understood, that the primary emphasis falls upon the outward expression of the dissent rather than on its content of opinion. Ignatius could use other terms for schism, like μερισμός and σχίζειν, when he met the phenomenon in a church like that of the Philadelphians (vii).

'Never act apart from the bishop, keep your flesh as God's temple, love unity, avoid divisions, be followers of Jesus Christ (in his obedience) as he was of his Father.'

Yet even there opinion enters into the situation (see Philad. iii). And equally so here, in the case of αἵρεσις. Insubordination or dissent implied wrong views of God and the Church, if it also was occasionally the outcome, to some degree, of personal pique and spite, on the part of presbyters or laity.

Finally, Trallians illustrates one or two of the distinctive idioms of the writer, notably his compressed style. He is exuberant in temperament, but not in language. Indeed his trenchant style becomes clumsy and awkward now and then, as he attempts to crush an extra idea into some quick, short phrase. One method employed for this purpose is a daring use of εἰς or ἐν. I have already commented in this Review (April, 1930, 153 f.) on the meaning of ἐν πίστει in Magn. i, and Trallians contains examples of both prepositions being twisted to suit the writer's eager thought. Thus in the inscription, after speaking of Jesus Christ as our 'Hope,'²³ he adds ἐν τῇ εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναστάσει. The title Ἐλπίς ἡμῶν is one of the reminiscences of the Pastoral epistles (I Tim. 1, 1), for these, like Ephesians, belonged to the *corpus Paulinum* with which Ignatius was familiar, and there is no difficulty in understanding why he appended an allusion to the resurrection. But he wanted to pack into his phrase the thought of union with Christ in the risen life. This he frequently put more simply, e.g. in Ephes. xx (ζῆν ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ διὰ παντός), Rom. ii (εἰς αὐτὸν ἀνατεῖλω), etc. Here he inserts εἰς αὐτόν, as if to hint that by the resurrection Christians experience immortality as personal fellowship, since they possess the hope of being fully united to the Lord (as in ii). In the same inscription the pregnant use of ἐν with τῷ πληρώματι and ἀποστολικῷ χαρακτήρι raises a problem of interpretation (see above). Again, in xii, ἐν τῷ ἐλέει τοῦ θεοῦ (as in the Philadelphian inscription, ἐν παντὶ ἐλέει) is ambiguous; it may mean loosely that even within the sphere of God's mercy he requires their loving intercessions,²⁴ or, as he told the Smyrniotes (εἰς τὸ εὐρεθῆναί με ἐν τῇ αἰτήσει ὑμῶν μαθητήν, Polykarp vii),

²³ The Ascensio Isaiae (iv. 13) also has, 'many believers saw him, their Hope, even Jesus the Lord Christ.' Among the Ignatian touches in the later Asiatic document, The Epistle of the Apostles, there is the Lord's saying (xxi), 'I am the Hope of the despairing' (that is, of those who despair of any resurrection from the dead).

²⁴ The cohesive function of intercessory prayer is a favourite theme of Ignatius;

that only by their prayers could he be granted by God's mercy the κληρος he sought.²⁵ The source as well as the sense of the unusual phrase τὸ ἐν θεῷ πληθός (viii) is clear, even apart from the attractive well-attested variant ἐνθεον,²⁶ for although Paul never used πληθός of the Church, he spoke of churches being ἐν God and Christ. The use of εἰς with πιστεύω in ii (πιστεύσαντες εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ), as with μετάνοια in Philad. viii, is another effort to bring out the idea of personal entry into truth of life; there is a partial parallel in Magn. x, and a closer in Smyrn. vi (εἰς τὸ αἷμα Χριστοῦ). It is not so difficult as the christological phrase²⁷ in Magn. vii (εἰς ἓνα ὄντα). To believe εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ, is another method of saying what he had said in the inscription (εἰρηνεύουση ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ αἵματι-τῷ πάθει), and proves that Ignatius never expected all Christians to be martyrs, even when he stressed the divine πάθος and the Blood. In the last sentence of the letter there is a syntactical item which is unique,²⁸ πιστός with the infinitive. It is the only occasion on which Ignatius calls God²⁹ 'faithful,' and he departs from previous Christian usage, where πιστός ὁ θεός, when it is not an asyndeton, is followed by ὅς (Paul) or by ἵνα (I John 1, 9) as an equivalent for ὥστε ('he may be relied upon to . . .').

he is always pressing such prayer, for himself (Ephes. xi, xx, Magn. xiv, Rom ix, Philad. v, viii, Smyrn. xi), for other churches (Ephes. xxi, Magn. xiv, Rom. ix, Philad. x, Smyrn. xi), for outsiders (Ephes. x), and even for heretics (Smyrn. iv).

²⁵ This extension of ἐν in Hellenistic Greek is reflected in the Ascensio Isaiae (viii. 12); 'it is allowed you *in sorte domini* to come hither,' meaning, as Charles points out, 'though you share in the lot of your Lord.' 'Ἐν ὑμῖν γράψας (Trall. xii), as ἐν οἷς ἐλάλησα (Philad. vi), amounts to 'my letter to you' (literally, what I have written to you, or, in your case).

²⁶ See Holl's *Fragmente vornehmlich christlicher Kirchenväter aus den Sacra Parallela in Texte und Untersuchungen* (1899) ii. 2, 22. Were this what Ignatius wrote, it would show how freely he could use a word which had associations alien to his creed, for ἐνθεός denoted in the cults one in ecstatic rapture, who believed that this divine possession heralded immortality as freedom from bodily trammels.

²⁷ I have discussed this in *The Journal of Religion* (April, 1930), 174.

²⁸ Nehem. 13, 13 (πιστοὶ ἐλογίσθησαν . . . μερίζειν) is not an exact parallel.

²⁹ Or rather 'the Father,' i.e., as commonly in Ignatius, the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ, through whom He works on and for Christians from first to last, as a God of love and mercy. The bishop's theology is practically that of the Apostles' Creed; if there was any item in it which he took over without developing it, belief in the Spirit might be adduced (see Loofs, op. cit., 194-205), but certainly not 'I believe in God the Father.' For Ignatius this is far from being a theological abstraction. The Father raised the Son (Trall. ix, Smyrn. xi), in him Christ now

II

The following effort to render the letter into English will bring out the points already made in the plea for some rearrangement of the text, as well as the need of attending to contemporary Greek usage in the papyri and elsewhere. I have endeavoured to be idiomatic as well as accurate, on the lines of Lelong, whose French version seems to me to be superior to any version in any language. As it happens, this letter furnishes occasions for paying heed to language which should not be read in a strictly biblical light, without regard to the special nuances of a man like Ignatius. Thus it begins and ends with one of his favourite terms, ἄμωμος, which is commonly taken in its biblical sense of 'unblemished.' Justin does use it thus in his Dialogue, but in Ignatius the popular Hellenistic usage is occasionally more apt, namely 'sound' (as of health), 'unscathed,' or 'flawless'; the word becomes practically an equivalent for *ὕψιστων* in the Pastoral epistles. No doubt, Ignatius is thinking of a life to which no exception could be taken, but the sacrificial idea has passed from the word as from a term like ἀγνίσεται (xiii). Once again, the exact force of ζῆλος (in iv) is not suggested by a rendering like 'jealousy'; it denotes rather a special temptation of the writer as he feels irritated by opposition as well as unduly susceptible to admiration.

By means of brackets and parentheses it is possible to bring out also the abrupt transitions of thought; there is an apt case of this in iv, and again in xii (where he makes his very chains call out to the Trallians). The letter is, like the others, a pastoral letter, but it is the work of a man with a well-marked personality. His terse style and his pastoral insight are only equalled by his earlier contemporary the prophet John in the letters to the seven churches of Asia, or by the prophet who wrote the epistle of Judas. For such a telling, crisp treatment of religion we have to wait till we reach the Latin of Tertullian,

lives (Rom. iii, Smyrn. ii) and speaks (Rom. viii); to him Christians are called to come (Rom. vii, Philad. ix); he listens to their praise and notes their loyalty (Rom. ii, Ephes. iv) and he is the invisible 'bishop' of all Christians (Magn. iii), caring personally for their interests.

nearly a century later, where again a strong personality has command of a distinctive, epigrammatic style. When Ignatius dictates this letter to the Trallian church, he exhibits many of his characteristic qualities of mind and speech.³⁰ It is an average specimen of what he contrived to write in circumstances which were not too favourable to literary composition; his surging sentences have touches of self-revelation, sarcasm, irony, and pathos; they display tact and pastoral concern, with an eagerness of mind which sometimes recurs to a topic already mentioned, as if he felt obliged to tap the nail rapidly on the head again.

Furthermore, Trallians illustrates at once the writer's indebtedness to Paul and his independence of mind, his acquaintance with some of the Pauline epistles, and also his habit of striking out on a line of his own, both in style and in thought. It is to other letters that we must turn for some significant traces of the latter, e.g. to the fact that Ignatius uses *παρουσία* only once, and of the first advent, not of the second (Philad. ix), and that he never employs *κληρονόμος* or *κληρονομία*. The Pauline *δικαιούσθαι* is ignored, except twice in its secondary sense. Except in an echo of an Old Testament quotation by Paul, he never uses *σοφός* (Ephes. xviii), and *σοφία* is absent altogether from his vocabulary; so are *λύτρον* and *λύτρωσις*, while the verb occurs only once (Philad. xi *λυτρωθείσαν*) in the general sense of being pardoned. But Trallians happens to bring out his use of a term like *μαθητής*, which Paul never employed, and also some minor touches like the retention of *ἔρρωσθε* (see below). Special significance, however, attaches to another term, in this connexion. 'When He says, "The Son of Man must be rejected, insulted, and crucified," He appears to be speaking of somebody else, of one with *πάθος*.'³¹ So the gnostic theory ran, against which Ignatius is protesting in Trallians as elsewhere, and this helps to explain his fondness for summing up the essence of the gospel as a message of the sufferings (*πάθος*) of

³⁰ E.g., the ironical, double sense of *λαμβάνει* (vi), the play upon *λείπειν* (vi), and assonances or alliterations like *συνέδριον . . . σύνδεσμον* (iii), *χριστιανῆ . . . χρῆσθε* (vi), and *ἀναλαμβάντες ἀνακτήσασθε* (viii).

³¹ Excerpta ex Theodoto lxi; see Dr. R. P. Casey's edition (81, 150) in *Studies and Documents* i (1934).

Christ. It is not that he attaches any pre-eminent value to suffering over and above death, on the part of the Lord. The phrase is chosen in order to bring out what Paul meant by 'the cross of Christ' or 'Jesus Christ, and him crucified,' but Ignatius stresses *πάθος* on account of the docetic heresy, stamping the term afresh for his special purpose, instead of echoing what Paul had said. To suppose that he isolated *πάθος* is as serious a mistake of interpretation as it would be to accuse Luther of isolating the death of Christ when he declared *Cruce sola est nostra theologia*. The references to the *πάθος* of Christ are occasionally emphasized with real intensity, but they fall out of focus unless they are read in the light of their context, viz. the entire life of the Lord, which led up to the sufferings and issued, as vital power, from them. When he paused to explain the scope of the gospel, as in Magn. xi, he spoke of 'the birth and the passion and the resurrection, all really and truly enacted by Jesus Christ.' It is in the light of this conviction that the allusions to *πάθος* in the Trallian letter (inscription, xi) have to be read. Paul could indeed speak of the *παθήματα* of Christ and of Christians,³² but he never used *πάθος* except of 'passion' in its lower, human sense. Ignatius freely employed the term to express the supreme³³ experience connected with the Cross of a Lord who had been born and who had risen from the death that crowned such suffering. He even used the verb (*πάσχειν*) of Christ (Trall. x, Smyrn. ii and vii), which Paul never does, and he avoided the lower sense of *πάθος* altogether.

³² Ignatius only mentions *παθήματα* once (Smyrn. v), and then of Christians suffering. In the rhythmical confession of faith (Trall. ix) he has the unusual *ἐδιώχθη ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου*, but this was a Johannine term (John 15, 20 *ἐμὲ ἐδίωξαν*) already, and it recurs in the Christian strata of the Ascensio Isaiae (iii. 13), where the prophet predicts 'the coming of the Beloved from the seventh heaven . . . his human form (*ἐν εἵδει ἀνθρώπου*)' and also his persecution or tortures at the crucifixion (*καὶ ὁ διωγμὸς ὃν διωχθήσεται κτλ*), one of the passages which suggest echoes or affinities on the part of Ignatius with this apocalypse.

³³ After owning the value of the Old Testament revelation (Philad. ix), he adds, 'But the Gospel has something special and supreme — the advent of the Saviour, our Lord Jesus Christ, his passion, and the resurrection,' the Gospel thus being the consummation of *ἀφθαρσίας*. Which is his way of saying that in the gospel God had brought life and *ἀφθαρσίαν* to light (2 Tim. 1, 10). The distinctive feature for him in the cult of Jesus the Incarnate was that it effected the experience of immortality as no other cult of the period had done or could do; even the Old Testament revelation was but an anticipation.

Another illustration lies in the passionate self-depreciation of iii-iv. The similar outburst in Rom. iv really opens a new paragraph, but in Trallians it is a sudden expression of humility, which, as in the case of Paul (of whom he is indirectly thinking), is not incompatible with a high consciousness of spiritual authority. 'I could write to you, but convict as I am, I dare not be giving you orders like an apostle.' Then, anticipating the sneering comment that he refrained from high matters because he was incompetent, he protests that he has ample insight of a prophetic nature. 'Many an inspiration of God is mine indeed (πολλὰ φρονῶ ἐν θεῷ).' The sentence is abrupt; it is a specimen of the bold Greek written by Ignatius, and the text of the whole passage is beyond recovery. But, though a spurt of ejaculation, it leads up to what follows; the underlying thought is, 'I make no claims to apostolic authority — not that I am lacking, remember, in prophetic revelations or authority, but I am afraid of assuming airs (iv), and also I wonder (v) if you would all be able to understand me, owing to your spiritual immaturity.³⁴ Not' — he at once adds — 'that I can claim any merit on the score of such heavenly intuitions.' The writer's mind is moving quickly from one side to another of the situation, but moving naturally, even while at most points he recalls the very language of the apostle, especially when he asserts his own prophetic consciousness. Ignatius neither here nor elsewhere calls himself or any other Christian a prophet. He is merely meeting the obvious criticism that might be passed upon his hesitation to speak out, by claiming to be as eloquent, as well equipped with a prophet's direct revelations of *res sacrae*, as any gnostic or docetist with their highflying notions.

The temptation to assume airs on this score, as he was flattered by his admirers, is instantly acknowledged — ἵνα μὴ ἐν καυχῇσιν ἀπόλωμαι. But though the language reminds us of Paul's, the situation is personal and quite intelligible, with its emphasis on the need of *πράτης* or *πραῦπαθεία*.³⁵ As he hur-

³⁴ The reference to 'mere habes' (*νηπιος*), never used elsewhere, is an echo of 1 Cor. 3, 1-2, just as the language used to describe the heavenly mysteries recalls (as in Smyrn. vi) the words of Col. 1, 16 and Ephes. 3, 1.

³⁵ Stahl (*Patristische Untersuchungen* i, 159 f.) sees in the references to *πράτης*

riedly dictates what is crowding into his mind, he mentions this gentleness first as an episcopal virtue. He frankly admires in Polybius a quality which, he allows, does not come easily to himself. But what makes it especially difficult for him is not only the applause that tempts him to be puffed up; there is also the harsh treatment of his Roman guards and the authorities, which is apt to stir the ζῆλος of angry irritability. The argument of iv is that pride and passion alike, even in a good cause, injure the soul, render a man unworthy of being a genuine martyr, and so give the devil a triumph. Outsiders in the company may not see the inward resentment seething in his soul, as he is cavalierly treated by the Roman authorities and their minions, but he is conscious of it; others may take him for a saint, but he is alive to the unsaintly temper of irritation against his persecutors. The whole passage throws light upon the psychology of the man, especially upon his concern for the right spirit of martyrdom. He is no deliberate martyr; there is no evidence that he had provoked arrest at Antioch, though this is not impossible. Neither is there any proof that normally he had a hectic craving for suffering as such. Πάθος was not an obsession with him. When he recurs to this idea of ζῆλος (in Rom. v), it is in another connexion; there the devil is using his unconscious agents, the Roman Christians, he protests or rather fears, to thwart him of his desire and destiny of martyrdom in the arena; their well-meant sympathy seems to him to block his way to God. Here, however, the case is different; the devil's unconscious agents are either those who applaud him or those who provoke him to ungentle words and feelings by their brutal handling of him, till he becomes either uplifted or impatient. It is only after he has thus applied to himself the demand for πραότης that he proceeds to commend it to other Christians as humble submission to the

echoes of the Matthew-logion, μάθετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ὅτι πρᾶος εἰμι καὶ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ, as if this quality belonged to the *imitatio Christi* which Ignatius enjoins on Christians. There are allusions to the humble obedience of Christ on earth in the service of God (e.g. Magn. viii, xiii), but I cannot see that the words of Matth. 11, 29 are required to explain the *χριστομαθία* of Philad. viii, which is too general a term to require any such definite root.

episcopal ministry, not as a general virtue of the Christian character (so in viii and in Polykarp vi μακροθυμήσατε μετ' ἀλλήλων ἐν πραότητι); πραότης is linked to ὑποταγή, as against self-willed conceit fostered by highflying gossellers, whereas in his own case πραότης is the check upon ζῆλος, imposed by modesty, and also, on another side, calm forbearance under wrongs and insults. The interesting thing is to see Ignatius writing out of a situation which, whether pleasant or unpleasant, forces him to be self-conscious, and to find him alive to the dangers of this. It is possible to read the passage as reflecting a hope on the part of the Trallians that he might be released from imprisonment. There would thus be a nexus between the Romans passage and the present, if, as Sir William Ramsay once suggested,³⁶ the Trallians had already hinted that so distinguished a person would be freed 'through the exertions of the influential Romans.' Had Ignatius received such a message through Polybius, it might account for his resentment, as he deprecates warmly this well-meant but injudicious deference to himself. In any case, the ζῆλος of which he is sensible is not exactly the same as the peril which Bacon noted in his fifty-third Essay ('Of Praise'). The shrewd Englishman marked the handicap unwittingly inflicted on a man by praise which stirred up jealousy and envy among his fellow-politicians or superiors. But these eulogies of the *pessimum inimicorum genus, laudantes*, as Tacitus once called them (Agricola xli), damage a man's prospects in his vocation, whereas Ignatius feared the moral damage they did to his own soul. So deeply did he dread this, that he recurs to it again at the very close of the letter. 'I am still in danger' (xiii), the danger he had mentioned in iv and xii. In the lesser tension of a serious illness, Donne once wrote, 'Our critical day is not the very day of death, but the whole course of life' (Death's Duel). It was a special phase of this risk to the soul that the bishop of Antioch had in mind when he dictated such a sentence.

The letter begins as usual with an inscription or salutation. Commonly Ignatius opens by mentioning that he has been informed about the local church. He does so here, using ἔγνων (as

³⁶ The Church in the Roman Empire, 315.

in Philadelphians, *γνοὺς* in Magnesians) and *ἀποδεξάμενος* (as in Ephesians), but there is no direct link between the inscription and the first paragraph as there is in the letters to Smyrna and Philadelphia. The bulk of the letter falls into four paragraphs; i-iiia leads up to iiib-v, then comes vi-viiia, and viiib-xi concludes the message, while xii-xiii is the personal finale. It will be noticed that the greetings in xii-xiii are longer than in the preceding letters to Magnesia and Ephesus. This is partly because, as he started xii, he felt moved to add another impetuous word upon unity. No sooner does he begin with the customary *ἀσπάζομαι* than the counsel he has been just urging (at the end of xi) leaps into his mind again, and only in xiii does he return to the matter of greetings. When he takes farewell (in xiii) he uses, as in the other letters, *ἔρρωσθε*, a common term of epistolography,³⁷ instead of following the style of the apostle Paul. Also, he adds a general postscript to the *ἔρρωσθε* sentence, since the conclusion had been specially directed to the laity and the deacons. A further feature of the conclusion is the anxiety he still feels (xiii), as in the other two letters from Smyrna to Ephesus and Magnesia,³⁸ about his church at Antioch. Apparently there had been some delay in appointing a successor to himself. He may have feared that this was due to some local disaffection if not to the danger of electing anyone to so prominent a position when anti-Christian feeling was still rife in the city.

III

Ignatius, also called Theophorus, to the holy church at Tralles in Asia, beloved by God the Father of Jesus Christ, elect and worthy of God, enjoying peace through the flesh and blood, the passion, of Jesus Christ, who by his resurrection is our hope of union with himself — I salute this church after

³⁷ The word is not simply conventional with Ignatius; it retains something of its original sense. When he said 'Fare ye well,' he was thinking of their religious welfare, as is plain from his use of the imperative infinitive in his letter to Polykarp (viii *ἐρρῶσθαι ὑμᾶς διὰ παντός ἐν θεῷ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ εὐχομαι, ἐν ᾧ διαμείνητε ἐν ἐνότητι θεοῦ καὶ ἐπισκοπῇ*) and of the verb in Smyrn. xiii (*ἔρρωσθέ μοι ἐν δυνάμει πατρὸς*), where the sense is 'Strength to you' or 'Be strong.'

³⁸ It may be accidental that while Ignatius calls the Ephesians, the Romans, and the Philadelphians his *ἀδελφοί* outright, and hails the Smyrniotes and the Magnesians as his *ἀγαπητοί*, he never addresses the Trallians thus. He does describe them, however, as *ὄντας μου ἀγαπητοὺς* (viii).

the manner of the apostles with full blessing, and bid her greeting right heartily.

(i) What a flawless mind ³⁹ you possess, unwavering under the strain — and 'tis yours by nature, no acquirement — well do I know this; your bishop Polybius informed me of it, when by the will of God and of Jesus Christ he appeared at Smyrna, congratulating me so warmly on being a prisoner for Christ Jesus that in his person I beheld all your company.⁴⁰ Welcoming then your godly goodwill through him, I gave God thanks for finding (so I learned) that you were followers of God. (ii) For,⁴¹ by submitting to the bishop as to Jesus Christ, you show me that you are living not after the world but after Jesus Christ, who died for us that by believing in his death you might escape

³⁹ *διάνοια* carries the sense of disposition or purpose here; sound or flawless (*ἁμωμον*) loyalty to convictions is an innate quality of their being. 'Yours by nature, not by acquirement' is a side-stroke at the gnostic claim to be spiritual by nature (*φύσει*), whereas ordinary church-members, on a lower level, merely received the grace of God by acquiring it through a proper exercise of freewill (*χρήσει*), or for a time. This was specially held by the Valentinians (Irenaeus i. 6 and vi. 4). Your Christianity, Ignatius assures the Trallians, has been implanted by God; it is not an extra, or a passing phase of endowment for life, which God may withdraw from you at any time. Of course, as elsewhere he indicates (e.g. in viii as in Ephes. i), this divine nature had to be carefully trained and exercised by Christians. In his own way he says what the writer of the Epistle of James had said, *ἐν πράττειν δέξασθε τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον* (1, 21); this underlies the collocation of *ἐκλεκτῇ καὶ ἀξιόθελῳ* in the inscription, since the Trallian church had shown itself deserving of God's choice, living up to the nature which He had implanted within them. But here his point is that the catholic faith is not a mere product of training, much less a second-rate degree of favour from God. As he had explicitly said, in the inscription, catholics, not gnostics, are the 'elect,' the recipients of 'full blessing.'

⁴⁰ Instead of holding aloof, Polybius had entered fully into the joy of Ignatius in his bondage, assuring him of the sympathy felt for him by the church which he represented, and also of their undeviating loyalty to Church faith and order. This loyalty, vividly exhibited to him by the bishop, convinced Ignatius that the Trallian Christians must indeed be 'followers' (literally 'imitators,' *μιμηταί*) of God, as they were reproducing the divine plan of life revealed in the hierarchical polity. *Συντρέχειν τῇ γνώμῃ τοῦ θεοῦ . . . τῇ γνώμῃ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου* (Ephes. iii, iv).

⁴¹ The unity of thought in i-ii and the first sentence of iii is the idea that the being as well as the well-being of the Church depends upon submission to the authorities. The link between i and ii, in *μιμητὰς θεοῦ*, is illustrated by Philad. vii, where from a slightly different angle the welfare of the Church is connected with a conscience for reproducing the principle of the divine order. Here the inscription strikes the first note of the Church, viz. loyalty to the Incarnation; the second note is struck in i-iii, viz. loyalty to the hierarchy, since apart from this no Christians can be genuine 'followers of God.' In i-iii Ignatius commends the church as a whole; it is only in what follows that he hints at another side of the matter, and in thus dealing with the local situation the letter, in musical parlance, passes from *legato* to *agitato*. As usual, however, even in telling them what they are, he means to remind them of what they should be.

death. It is needful then that you never act apart from the bishop (as indeed you never do); also you must be subject to the presbytery as to the apostles of Jesus Christ our Hope (in whom we shall have immortality⁴² if we live in him).⁴³ And as for those who serve as deacons in the mysteries of Jesus Christ, they must give satisfaction to all in every way, for they are no mere ministers of food and drink but servants of the Church of God; hence they must shun any cause of blame⁴⁴ like fire. (iii) Similarly,⁴⁵ let all revere the deacons as Jesus Christ himself, the bishop representing the Father and the presbyters being like God's council, the apostolic company; apart from these, there is no Church.⁴⁶ On all this I am persuaded that you agree with me. I received, I keep by me, the very model of your love in the person of your bishop. His very bearing is a great lesson; his gentleness is his power — a man whom even the godless,⁴⁷ I am sure, revere.

Out of love, I spare⁴⁸ you any sharp words on this matter;⁴⁹ I could write, but, convict as I am, I dare not be giving you orders like an apostle. (iv)

⁴² Literally 'be found at death,' as in Philipians 3, 9. So below in xii and xiii.

⁴³ Again, as in the inscription (τῆς ἐλπίδος κτλ.), Ignatius goes off into an eager rapture at the mention of Jesus Christ, though ἐν ᾧ διάγοντες implies indirectly deference to the bishop and the presbytery, since to live 'in' or 'after' (κατά) Jesus Christ means more than any individual piety. The insertion of ἐν ᾧ after διάγοντες, by the Curetonian Syriac (followed by Lightfoot), might suggest explicitly that by thus 'living in (subjection to) the bishop, we shall be found within Christ at death'; but the shorter text is sufficient and more idiomatic. The same thought recurs in Magn. vi.

⁴⁴ 'Above reproach' (ἐγκλήματα), like the deacons in I Tim. 3, 10 (ἀνέγκλητοι).

⁴⁵ This opening sentence of iii carries on and completes the theme of i-ii. Ὁμοίως (so in I Peter 3, 1 and 7, with 5, 5) introduces the reciprocal aspect; for some reason Ignatius speaks about the διάκονοι at length, and upon their responsibilities, before insisting on the laity showing them respect.

⁴⁶ Or, 'no church deserves the name of Church,' if it does not acknowledge the threefold order of the ministry. Surely the sentence bears more than what Zahn allows, in his Ignatius von Antiochen (1873, 300); the reference is more radical than to 'any meeting or service of the church, held without the sanction or the presence of the bishop.' When Ignatius intended to say that only, he said it, as he did in Smyrn. viii. The climax of the argument in the first paragraph comes in this χωρὶς ('apart from'). In the following sentence Ignatius closes by catching up the reference to Polybius in i, and making it more personal.

⁴⁷ Possibly ἀθέους means the heretics or dissenters of x (as Bruston holds), but more likely non-Christians, who are impressed by gentleness in a bishop as well as in ordinary Christians (Ephes. x).

⁴⁸ Here begins the second paragraph, which ends naturally with v. Ignatius, it now appears, had a reason for stressing the personal qualities of the bishop at the end of the first paragraph; it is hinted that some of the Trallians were not too respectful to Polybius. In fact, Ignatius explains, it was only his affection for the church that kept him from speaking severely to them (*severius*, Funk; *ernster*, Zeller) on the subject of insubordination. This leads him to explain at once his own authority as a spiritual counsellor and his reluctance to exercise it.

⁴⁹ The MSS. and versions differ so definitely here that some break in the text

Many an inspiration of God is mine indeed, but I take my own measure,⁵⁰ lest I be ruined by a boastful spirit; I have more need, now-a-days, to be afraid, instead of listening to praise that puffs me up; flatterers⁵¹ are my scourge. (I do long to suffer as a martyr, but I know not if I be worthy; others may not see my angry irritation, but sorely does it ravage me. What I need is the gentleness that defeats the Prince of this world.) (v) Not able to write to you about heavenly mysteries? Indeed I can. But you are mere babes, and I fear to harm you. So pardon me — I am withholding the food, lest you fail to swallow it, and thus choke yourselves! Why, even I myself, though honoured to be a prisoner, though well able to grasp heavenly mysteries, the angelic hierarchy, the heavenly host of rulers, things seen and things unseen — for all that, I am not a disciple⁵² yet. No, much is lacking in our quest for God.

(vi) I do beseech you⁵³ (though it is not I but the love of Jesus Christ),⁵⁴

is indicated; G and L actually read ἀγαπώντας ὡς οὐ before φείδομαι, with ἐαυτὸν πρότερον instead of συντονώτερον. At any rate ὑπὲρ τούτου alludes to the theme of the preceding paragraph, and should be rendered 'on this matter' rather than 'on his behalf,' whether 'his' refers to Christ or to Polybius. The text rendered above (Bunsen, Funk, Zahn, Lightfoot, Bihlmeyer) seems sound, though Lightfoot supplies οὕτως and Bruston ὥσει ('en quelque sort') before φείδομαι ('spare'), whilst Zahn reads γράφειν, δυνάμενός περ ('though I very well might,' Chevallier, after Wake). It is not till the very end, in xii (ἐξαιρέτως καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις), that Ignatius hints at the truth; the local presbyters were not all supporting the bishop as they should.

⁵⁰ Another Pauline reminiscence (2 Corinth. 10, 13; 12, 1-7).

⁵¹ οἱ γὰρ λέγοντές μοι. Perhaps what his praisers (Smyrn. v) actually said has dropped out of the text, something like 'you are a real Theophoros' or 'you will be a true martyr.' The longer recension reads the easy ἐπαινούντες.

⁵² I.e. a perfected Christian. In Ignatius the term μαθητής is on the way to become almost an equivalent for 'martyr,' probably inspired by the saying 'Whosoever does not carry his cross and come after me, he cannot be my disciple' (Luke 14, 37).

⁵³ This third paragraph (vi, vii, and the first sentence of viii as the climax) swings from the thought, arising out of the previous paragraph, that surely the Trallians will be able to understand a general warning against αἵρεσις such as Ignatius feels both obliged and competent to issue, as well as an admonition upon the proper way to avoid such errors, viz., by adhering to the apostolic ministry. He thus comes round to the idea underlying i-iii, and the first sentence of viii is one of his kindly assurances (see Magn. xi, Smyrn. iv) that he is not blaming them so much as putting them upon their guard. The dominant note in αἵρεσις here, as the context indicates, is sectarianism or indifference to the hierarchy; though (as in Ephes. vi) this connotes a break-away from the truth of the Incarnation, which, according to Ignatius, is bound up with the sacraments as administered by the bishop, still the emphasis at present is on the anti-episcopal side of the movement. Not until the next paragraph (ix, x) does he touch directly the 'heretical' teaching of these separatists.

⁵⁴ 'I am overflowing with love for you . . . yet not I but Jesus Christ' (Philad. v). The genitive here is subjective, not 'love for Jesus Christ.'

use only Christian fare and eschew strange food⁵⁵ — I mean, dissent; for dissenters, in order to win confidence, infuse Jesus Christ into their errors, like those who proffer a deadly drug in honeyed wine, till the unsuspecting gladly drink it, and drink death in the sweet poison. (vii) Beware of such! You can avoid them by declining to be puffed up,⁵⁶ by adhering inseparably to Jesus Christ, the bishop, and the apostolic precepts.⁵⁷ Inside the sanctuary one is pure, outside the sanctuary one is impure; that is, anyone who takes any action apart from the bishop, the presbytery, and the deacons, has not a pure conscience. (viii) Not that I have heard of any such thing among you; in my love I am simply putting you on your guard against snares of the devil⁵⁸ which I foresee.

Yours be a gentle⁵⁹ spirit then, once more; yours the new nature⁶⁰ of faith (the flesh of the Lord) and love (the blood of Jesus Christ); let none of you quarrel with his neighbour; never let any folly on the part of some in-

⁵⁵ Here, as in Philad. iii, the weedy anti-episcopal propaganda; i.e. dissent or schism rather than heresy (in the modern sense of the term). Hence the warning (in vii) against being 'puffed up' by a dissenting, pretentious movement that makes its adherents despise the bishop and his sacraments, as if these were not absolutely valid.

⁵⁶ I.e. as though you felt yourselves independent of the apostolic faith, guaranteed by the bishop. The opposite of being 'puffed up' is (as in Magn. xi and xiii) a humble readiness to follow the apostolic faith taught by the Church through the three orders of the ministry, since that alone means the presence and possession of Jesus Christ.

⁵⁷ Neither these *διατάγματα* nor the *δόγματα* of Magn. xiii necessarily denote anything like the Apostles' Creed in a primitive form, much less a Johannine institution of the episcopate in Asia Minor. Some objective authority may be in the writer's mind, but how it was supposed to be embodied or transmitted, we cannot say. Phrases like this simply show how Ignatius was convinced that the apostles 'had impressed certain features on the Church's life, they had started its career on certain lines, its development could only move within certain limits' (C. H. Turner, *The Early History of the Church and Ministry*, 114).

⁵⁸ The devil is behind dissent (so Philad. vi), which is one of his crafty 'ambushes.' But probably here and certainly in *ἀφορμάς* ('opportunity') below, Ignatius was not conscious of the military tinge in the metaphor, though he did see in docetism and anti-episcopacy manoeuvres of 'Ο ἄρχων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, and in another connexion speaks of defeating or deposing him, in ordinary militant language (*καταλύεται* iv, as in Philostratus, *Vita Apoll.* v. 35 οὐ κατέλυσας Νέρωνα).

⁵⁹ In this fresh paragraph, *πραῦστα* lightly reiterates the warning (of vii) against divisive self-conceit, but it is now applied to the general behaviour of the Trallian Christians, in view of the outside world. *Μηδεὶς . . . ἐχέτω* is a special application of *ἀγάπη*, but since Christian love is bound up with faith (as right belief in the gospel of the Incarnation), Ignatius proceeds (ix-xi) to explain in detail what he had meant by the *ἐνέδρας τοῦ διαβόλου*, that is, the specious, spurious teaching of docetists. There is no break in the brief discussion, for x is merely an aside, suggested as usual by his recollection of the apostle Paul, and xi sums up the argument of ix.

⁶⁰ Cotelier was the first to suspect that *ἀνακτήσασθε* had been changed into the

dividuals give pagans an opportunity to scoff at the People of God — for ⁶¹ ‘Woe to him whose senseless ways cause any to scoff at my Name!’

(ix) Shut your ears against any preaching that has no place for ⁶² the Jesus Christ ⁶³

‘Of David’s lineage, of Mary,
Really born, who ate and drank,
Really persecuted under Pontius Pilate,
Really crucified and killed,
In sight of heaven and earth and of the underworld,
Really raised from the dead’ —

when his Father raised him up, even in the same manner as ⁶⁴ his Father will also raise up us who believe in him, by Christ Jesus, without whom we have no real life. (x) Whereas, ⁶⁵ if he merely seemed to suffer, as some atheists of

ἀνακτίσασθε of the traditional text. Both terms, *ἀναλαμβάνειν* and *ἀνακτῶσθαι*, are employed together by Epictetus (iii. 25, 4 *εὐθύς ἀναλαβόντι καὶ ἀνακτησαμένῳ ἑαυτόν*) in the same sense. Ignatius hints at the need for fresh attention to the exercise of spiritual qualities (see above on i). The force of the repeated *ἀνα-* may be brought out by using ‘new’ and ‘once more’; the general idea of both terms in this combination is that of pulling oneself together, as the papyri indicate.

⁶¹ A free citation, from memory, of Isaiah 52, 5, which had been introduced into Christian usage by Paul (Rom. 2, 24). But, like the author of Second Clement (13, 2) and Polykarp (Phil. x), Ignatius quotes it in connexion with the bad impression made upon pagans by any quarrelsome Christians — *ἄφρονες*, who defied or ignored the law of brotherly love, insensible to the living truth of their religion (so Ephes. 5, 17). In Smyrn. vi Ignatius definitely accuses the gnostic errorists of being indifferent to charitable behaviour.

⁶² I translate *χωρίς* thus, to bring out the emphatic tone of the term as Ignatius often employed it; a deliberate antithesis haunts his mind, whether he is speaking of people who broke away from the bishop or from the genuine Christ. The word occurs in this letter as often as in all the others put together.

⁶³ Docetists (vi) might indeed talk of Jesus Christ, but not of the ‘really’ incarnate Lord. The confession of faith takes a rhythmical form, as in I Tim. 3, 16, with *ἀληθῶς* as the catchword of Ignatius against docetists. It is the prophet becoming lyrical, conscious that a confession of faith is to be sung.

⁶⁴ Zahn corrects *ὁς* to *οὗ*, followed by editors like Krüger and Bauer, in preference to the Coptic, Syriac, and Armenian *ὡς* (Whiston, Frey, Russell, Bruston, and Hilgenfeld). The general sense is unaffected, however.

⁶⁵ In this tense aside he has 1 Corinth. 15, 12 and 15 and 32 in mind. ‘My martyrdom means that I am following a Lord who did die. If he did not really die, then I am misrepresenting him to the world.’ Here (as in Smyrn. ii and v) he seems to regard the docetists as almost on the level of pagans, since to deny the real humanity of the Lord was to invalidate salvation; in view of vii, he could call such errorists *ἄθεοι* logically — though not of course as if he meant people who believed in Christ but not in God. ‘These atheists of unbelievers’ is a phrase

unbelievers allege ('tis they who merely seem to exist!),⁶⁶ why should I be a prisoner? Why long to fight the wild beasts? I shall be dying to no purpose. What I say of the Lord then ⁶⁷ is but a lie! (xi) Shun these vile, adventitious growths; a poisonous fruit they yield, and he who eats it dies outright. No 'planting of the Father,' ⁶⁸ these; if they were, they would be seen to be branches of the Cross, with fruit immortal,⁶⁹ for 'tis by the Cross, by his own passion, that he calls you to himself, you who are his members. (No head can exist ⁷⁰ without members!) 'Tis God who promises this union, He who is unity himself.

(xii) From Smyrna I send you my greetings, with those of God's churches who are beside me here, who have richly refreshed me outwardly and also inwardly. My very bonds, the bonds I bear for the sake of Jesus Christ as I pray to attain God — these bonds beseech you, 'Maintain your concord and your common prayers.' For it befits you as individuals, and particularly the presbyters, to encourage the bishop, in honour of God the Father, of Jesus Christ, and of the apostles. Pray listen to me in love, that my letter may not be a witness against you.⁷¹ And pray for me; I do need your love, with

which is echoed later in writers like Origen (Cels. ii. 3) and Tertullian (De Carne Christi 15), when dealing with errorists like the docetists.

⁶⁶ An apt parallel to this stroke is found in Tertullian's word on the Valentini-ans; *ita omnia in imagines urgent, plane et ipsi imaginarii Christiani* (Adv. Val. 27). It was from this epigrammatic phrase of Ignatius (λέγουσι τὸ δοκεῖν πεπονθέναι αὐτόν, αὐτοὶ ὄντες τὸ δοκεῖν) that towards the end of the century these errorists got their name of Docetists. It is an anachronism, although it is convenient, to speak of them as such in the age of Ignatius himself.

⁶⁷ The neat correction of οὐ into οὖν is due to Voss. It is now confirmed by the Coptic version. The alternative would be either to omit (so the longer recension and the Armenian version) or to interpret the negative as an indignant interrogative (with Jacobson, Bunsen, Dressel, Hilgenfeld, Scholz, Hoole, and Hefele).

⁶⁸ A reminiscence of Matthew (15, 13), as in Philad. iii. In the next clause (as already in ii and iv) the Syriac idiom requires φαίνεσθαι to be rendered 'be seen to be,' not 'appear.'

⁶⁹ 'We belong to his fruit, thanks to his blessed passion' (Smyrn. i). The fruit or outcome of docetism cannot be immortality, it is implied, for it lacks the vital core of the living Christ who has been really crucified. Having no Cross, such a gospel lacks the power to generate immortality.

⁷⁰ This (γεννηθῆναι) is Lightfoot's suggestion ('be found') for γεννηθῆναι. The point of this saying about the divine Κεφαλὴ presupposing μέλη is put otherwise in Smyrn. viii (ὅπου ἂν ᾖ Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία). If this argument, which started in viii and which closes here, be compared with the other allusion to μέλη (in Ephes. iv), it will be seen that both stress the vital outcome of faith in ἀγάπη or εὐ πράσσειν as the evidence of such union with the Lord.

⁷¹ Accept my instructions and directions (a common meaning of ἀκούειν, ὁ ἀκούων being 'the learner'), in the spirit in which they are offered (see iii and vi), instead of resenting them.

God's own mercy, if I am ever to be awarded the heritage appointed me,⁷² if I am not to prove a castaway.⁷³

(xiii) The love of the Smyrniotes and of the Ephesians greets you.

In your prayers, remember the church in Syria; unworthy am I to be a member of it, I the least of all its members.

Fare ye well in Jesus Christ; be subject to the bishop as to the divine command, also to the presbytery; love one another, all of you, with undivided heart.

My spirit is devoted to you,⁷⁴ not only now but when I attain to God. I am in danger still; but the Father is faithful, to fulfil my prayers and yours in Jesus Christ — in whom may you be found unscathed!

IV

The letter to the Christians at Tralles, thus re-set, illustrates several of the idiosyncrasies that vein the writer's character. Though it does not show his mind at its fuller range, as some of the other letters do, notably Ephesians, it represents the normal Ignatius rather than, as some have thought, a mood of re-action. Here we seem to overhear the spoken words of a father in God. Like any genuine letter, it has 'I' and 'you'; it is interested in the affairs of those to whom it is addressed, and also it reveals the intimate soul of the writer. Yet it is a pastoral letter, resembling the earlier, shorter letter which had been sent to another church in Asia, also ἐκλεκτῇ and also exposed to the same risk of docetism. In the Second epistle of John the presby-

⁷² I.e. of martyrdom (as in Rom. i). For *περίκειμαι* (in *κλήρου οὐ περίκειμαι ἐπιτυχεῖν*) the Latin version reads *conor*, which may be (Smith) an error for *coronor* in the sense of *cingor*, but it has suggested *οὐπὲρ ἔγκειμαι* (Bunsen, Lightfoot, Srawley), though this meaning of the verb ('press eagerly') does not recur in Ignatius. He means either that the *κλήρος* was appointed him ('set before him') or that he was all eager for it — 'que je suis tout près d'obtenir' (Lelong), 'que je souhaite ardemment d'obtenir' (Bruston), 'le lot que je m'efforce d'obtenir' (Delafosse), or 'den zu erlangen mir gar sehr angelegen ist' (Zeller). But it is not easy to see how this comes out of *περίκειμαι*. Conjectures like *παράκειμαι* (Vedel, Hilgenfeld) and *ὑπόκειμαι* (Smith) are unhelpful, though Ivar Heikel's *οὐπὲρ κείμαι* (Studien und Kritiken, 1935, 317) would certainly straighten out the text. The Coptic version has *ὅς ἐμὲ κοσμήσει*. Either the original verb has been lost, or *περίκειμαι* has been twisted to suit the writer's purpose, whether he thought of himself as 'invested' with the *κλήρος* or of the *κλήρος* as imminent (*sorlem mihi instantem*, Dressel, Funk).

⁷³ A final echo of I Corinthians (9, 27 *μήπως ἄδόκιμος γένωμαι*).

⁷⁴ A parallel to this *ἀγνίσεται ὑμῶν τὸ ἐμὸν πνεῦμα* occurs in Ephes. viii (*περίψημα ὑμῶν καὶ ἀγνίζομαι ὑμῶν*, 'I am your humble, devoted servant'), where again the

ter we possess a closer analogy to Trallians than even in any of Paul's epistles; a missive like Second John presupposes that the local church is threatened by ultra-spiritual ideas of Jesus Christ, and that the writer has a certain authority to speak upon such a peril. Like John the presbyter (if he be also taken to be the author of the Apocalypse), the ex-bishop of Antioch writes in Trallians as a prophet of the Lord, who employs the letter as a means of conveying his message or rather his directions to a church. He is conscious of his responsible position as a prophet and even as an apostle; but through all his admonitions the personality of the writer emerges, even although it is less hectic or expansive here than in any of the other five letters addressed by him to the churches. The father in God is a very human person — sometimes, it would seem, more humble than modest, but nevertheless conscious of his dependence on the very people whom he sought to direct in behaviour and belief. For example, if he cries, 'pray for me,' it is not because Paul had been in the habit of doing this already; it is spontaneous, the throb of a genuinely Christian instinct.

He was a saint of the choleric temperament, like St. Jerome and St. Columba. He did give bishops a higher place than the Celtic saint did, but this was due to his passionate conviction of unity as essential and organic to the faith. Were 'mystical' a less vague adjective, Ignatius might be termed a mystical churchman — with the emphasis on 'churchman.' He never conceived of unity except in terms of personality and fellowship; the aim was not to be 'goddied' or to be absorbed in the Infinite, but to reach or attain God (*θεοῦ τυχεῖν, ἐπιτυχεῖν*).⁷⁵ He displays no interest in any manifestation of God through Nature; it was not there but in the divine movement through Jesus the incarnate Christ that real unity was guaranteed (xi),

ὑπέρ is omitted after the verb. In contemporary Greek *περίλημμα* had weakened in force, while *ἀγνίζομαι* amounted colloquially to our 'devoted' ('mon esprit se dévoue pour vous,' Delafosse); the sacrificial significance of the metaphor had begun to fade out, in both terms.

⁷⁵ This is the point which he is trying to make in his forced, elliptic saying, *πολλὰ γὰρ ἡμῖν λείπει, ἵνα θεοῦ μὴ λειπώμεθα* (v), 'we are short of much (that we need to secure) if we are not to fall short of God,' i.e. if we members of the Church are not to fail in our (*ἐπι*)*τυχεῖν τοῦ θεοῦ*.

and this supreme boon of life was mediated through worship directed by the hierarchy. The *raison d'être* of church-orders for him lies in his realistic idea of the Incarnation, and what corresponds to this basic belief of Ignatius is a thought like that of the Son and Redeemer commissioning his apostles with powers as his representatives; 'As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you.' Naively Ignatius finds the divine organism of the Church to be controlled by bishop, presbyters, and deacons, a real 'hierarchy' or sacred order in which the original divine Command is, as it were, projected into the present, where it answers somehow to the Father, Son, and Apostles, securing life for the faithful through the fellowship of the Altar (vii), with the eucharist as the vital tie (viii). Thus and only thus, he believed, was the unity reproduced and realized on earth, as God designed it to be. Divisiveness and dissent were therefore of the devil, and he denounces them heartily. It is in the light and context of this older belief that he re-interprets faith and order within the Church. The one significant thing in the world, the sole reality amid shadows, was this movement of God in history, through Jesus Christ, and as he presses and expresses this, imaginatively rather than speculatively, it is because he was not a Christian among other things; even in such passing allusions as the Trallian letter yields, we catch the throb of his overpowering devotion to the Centre, to the Passion of the Lord and all that it meant for unity. Indeed in all the three letters from Smyrna he appears to feel that once he has coined his edged phrase about unity with God, he has reached the climax (xi). 'One with God!' It is so in Ephesians (xx) and Magnesians (xiii). As he is being hurried across country, he has merely time to recall the churches to this ultimate union. When he grows hot is as a rule when he is reminded either of docetists who were turning such a saving Reality into an illusion by their new idealism, or of nominal Christians who (viii, xiii) failed to appreciate the synthesis of faith and unselfish, dutiful love within their fellowship. It is his engrossing interest in the Cross as the Centre of a divine movement drawing men into union with God and one another, that explains his anxious, even fierce concern over propaganda

which, in his view, threatened to empty that movement of any vital force. He is never so pithy as in denouncing docetists who taught that the divine aeon of Christ only descended upon the human Jesus at baptism and was withdrawn from him before the Passion. Such propaganda roused Ignatius to indignant protests, particularly when people propounded these views in dissenting from the bishop and the other authorities, by setting up conventicles of their own. This struck at the essential unity and concord of which God was not merely the lover but the author. It alarmed and angered our Theophorus.

Generally Ignatius uses the term 'Christian' in connexion with a plea for real religion in its practical significance (as in Polykarp vii, Rom. iii, and Magn. x). Crashaw's couplet,

'Christ's faith makes but one body of all souls,
And Love's that body,'

serves to sum up the stress of Ignatius upon faith and love as the two foci of the Christian ellipse, against errorists and divisive individualists. But, as a churchman, he also talks of 'Christian' in connexion with collective loyalty to the apostolic faith and order (as in Trall. vi, Magn. iv, vi, and Ephes. xi). He never mentions individuals but only the Church as the object of the divine love, and he does not address his readers as 'saints' or 'brothers,' but always as 'the Church' or 'the People' or 'the Body';⁷⁶ it is their common prayers, their common worship, their mutual service that he emphasizes as the expression of their relationship to the divine concord and unity. And the latter implies — this is fundamental in his so-called 'mystical' conception or synthesis of religion — a graded order in heaven and on earth, so that he can boldly speak of Christians imitating Christ as they submit to the authorities, since Christ obeyed the Father. 'As the Lord never did anything, either by himself or through the apostles, without the Father'

⁷⁶ Perhaps also as the Community or Polity, if τὸ κοινόν is to be taken thus in Philad. i and Polykarp iv; the phrase is used by Lucian in his satire upon Christian attentions to a martyr (De Morte Peregrini xiii), but, in spite of Zahn (Ignatius von Antiochen, 333) and De Genouillac (L'Eglise Chrétienne au temps de Saint Ignace d'Antioche, 1907, 11, 126), this civic sense is uncertain. In any case it is not normal.

(Magn. vii), so with Christians in the Church (Ephes. iv, Smyrn. ix). This accounts for the naively realistic counsels on submission; it is a fixed idea with Ignatius that submission to the clergy is a vital condition of unity, a mark of genuine Christianity (Trall. ii, Magn. xiii, etc.). As an august organism, inspired by God who is the source of unity, the Church requires such a humble recognition of authority embodied in the various orders. Not that Ignatius confines the spirit of humble deference to this relationship. He can say, 'Be subject to the bishop and to one another' (Magn. xiii). But he also likes to apply a favourite text from the Old Testament to anti-episcopalians. 'He who does not attend the common assembly is already a proud person, one who has thereby separated himself. It is written, "God opposes the proud." So let us be very careful not to oppose the bishop, that by submitting to him we may belong to God' (Ephes. v). Nothing could be more explicit; the jurisdiction of the bishop and his staff has its prototype in heaven.

This church-mysticism is unintelligible unless we recollect that it belongs to the world-view of Ignatius. He is not simply saying in his own way what had been said by Paul and John about the Church, and saying it afresh for new conditions. Like many another early Christian, he saw the divine unity relating itself to the soul and the world through a succession of powers and unseen agencies. The celestial cosmos was peopled by good and evil spirits in hierarchies (see Trall. v), controlled by a supreme Head. Such a vague belief, fostered by apocalyptic (under some Iranian influences), regarded spiritual power as operating more or less through aeons and angels in graded rank. Furthermore, the conception of a divine βασιλεία implied for the ancient mind a polity corresponding to the civic polity on earth, ruled by emperor or king with viceroys, deputies, and authorized assemblies. Authority touched the individual in the State as he came into touch with the delegates or agents near himself. It is true that Ignatius preferred to think of authority in terms of a divine οἰκονομία rather than of a βασιλεία. He was living under an emperor like Trajan, who took the greatest pains to keep in touch with his subjects over the em-

pire, by means of governors, prefects, proconsuls, and councils; every individual was conscious that he belonged to the graded system of administration which was so congenial to the Roman temperament, and on the whole so effective. Yet, unlike Clement of Rome, Ignatius does not recall any parallel from the imperial system any more than from the cosmos, in the interests of church order. The latter, he is convinced, is the reflex of the heavenly *οικονομία*. The end is not far off. During these brief, bad days, *ἔσχατοι καιροί* (Ephes. xi), the warfare of the Church against the serried ranks of evil in the unseen world (Trall. v) is to be carried on through the disciplined obedience of those who belong to the divine polity on earth, as that is true to the Lord's delegated Command and Will of order. This vibrating conception of the Church and its heavenly archetype is presupposed in Trallians, though less developed than in some of the other letters. Ignatius could not write to any Church without recalling it to its base of operations⁷⁷ against the Prince of this world. As a prophet, he was inspired by the need for rallying the militant *ἐκκλησία*. Have frequent gatherings for worship, he tells the Ephesians (xiii), 'for thus the forces of Satan are shattered, and his malevolence destroyed, owing to your concord of faith. Nothing is better than this peace of harmony, by which every assault upon the church in heaven and on earth is brought to nought.' Such effective worship is bound up with the graded order of the ministry which links the faithful to the heavenly powers at Headquarters.

This fundamental idea of individuals in the *ἐκκλησία* enjoying peace and safety as they submit to the representatives and duly appointed groups through which the supreme Authority exercises control of all for their good and imparts His own support, is at the heart of the church-mysticism in Ignatius. His development of it relates him definitely to the rising gnostic philosophies of creation and communion through a series of intermediate forces, aeons and angels, with their graded ranks in the cosmic order. Whether his imagination plays with the music of the spheres or with the vision of a vast divine House-

⁷⁷ Once he does use *ἀρέσκω* in its military sense (Polykarp vi, as in 2 Tim. 2, 4); see note above on viii.

hold, organized for the benefit of its inmates, the tendency is always in the direction of this mediated relationship. The remarkable thing is, that just as he seems to touch the shimmering world of gnostic beings, he takes his own line. He shows little or no interest in angels, for example, when he is dealing with the *ἐκκλησία*. Unlike the prophet John, he has no guardian 'angels of the churches.' Neither to angels nor to Nature did the mystical mind of Ignatius turn. He says far less about angels than the apostle Paul had done. The heavenly order for him was essentially the Father, the Son, and the Apostles, with the incarnate Son as the vital Centre of the Church. The gnostics as a rule hardly knew what to do with Jesus. His personality fascinated them and perplexed them; it was an intractable quantity which they had to fit into their systems of aeons somehow, generally by reducing the real humanity, which conflicted with their rooted suspicion of matter. Ignatius gloried in the humanity, in the flesh and blood, of the Lord — so much so that he lost sight of angels as he concentrated upon Jesus Christ 'in flesh and spirit.' His mythos of the new Man as Redeemer has its gnostic affinities, but the important point about it is that it accounts by itself for the revelation of immortality and for the polity of the Church as the one organism in which God's supreme love-gift of *ἀφθαρσία* could be received,⁷⁸ as He had directed; no angels intervene, not even in the poetical setting.

All this is presupposed, but little more than presupposed, in the Trallian letter, where again we catch only incidentally (in

⁷⁸ Antioch had been already disturbed by the baptist mission of Menander (mentioned by the longer recension among the 'vile adventitious growths' of Trall. xi), who not only ascribed creation to angels but promised immortality to his baptized adherents, as the one escape from created mortality. Ignatius does not use the sacrament of baptism into Christ as Paul had done, to bring out the union of Christians with Christ; his theology of the Incarnation leads him to prefer the Eucharist as the sacrament of union and immortality. In calling the *αἵρεσις* 'strange food' (vi), by the way, he does not imply that the docetic dissenters were interlopers, as Bruston imagines ('apportée du dehors'); it is not that they were outsiders but that such separatism is foreign to the Household of God (Philad. iii). In the light of Philad. ii, where the *ἀξιόπιστοι* also work by *ἡδονῇ κακῇ*, it is conceivable that Ignatius is hinting here at libertine tendencies in these enthusiasts of the spirit; but if so it is no more than a passing allusion.

χιι τὰ δεσμά μου ἃ ἔνεκεν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ περιφέρω, and possibly in the title of 'Theophorus') any echoes of the rapturous, surging note that resounds so thrillingly in some of the other letters (e.g. Smyrn. v, Ephes. ix, xi, and Romans *passim*). It is Crashaw again who echoes this, in his *Carmen Deo Nostro*: —

'O that it were as it was wont to be!
 When Thy old friends of fire, all full of Thee,⁷⁹
 Fought against frowns with smiles, gave glorious chase
 To persecutions, and against the face
 Of death and fiercest dangers durst with brave
 And sober pace march on to meet a grave.
 On their bold breasts, about the world they bore Thee,
 And to the teeth of Hell stood up to teach Thee.'

In the Trallian letter we find the 'sober pace,' if that could ever be said of Ignatius. But otherwise these lines describe aptly the passionate, defiant zeal of the man, as he bore about the world his chains and gloried in them. Were they not a testimony to his Lord, and he a true 'friend of fire' in the service? There was smoke in the fire of his torch. The blaze of it could be hectic as well as heroic. But one reason why his letters were preserved and treasured by the early Church was because men felt in such hard days of trial that it was good to recall the glowing martyr passion 'as it was wont to be.'

⁷⁹ A phrase — and an original phrase — of Ignatius himself (γέμετε θεοῦ, Magn. xiv). He might be literally called a friend 'of fire,' if the Syriac Nourono or Nourani (fiery), which was attached to his name, indicated that *Ignatius* was somehow connected with *ignis*, as Renan conjectures (Les Évangiles, 485).

THE GILD OF ZEUS HYP SISTOS

COLIN ROBERTS

ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD

THEODORE C. SKEAT

BRITISH MUSEUM

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

VDALRICO WILCKEN

PRINCIPI PAPYROLOGORVM

I. INTRODUCTION

THE text is written on a single sheet of papyrus cut from a roll; a join runs down the centre, and others are visible on either side. Top and sides of the sheet are more or less intact, but it is broken off at the foot and there is nothing to indicate its original height. We may perhaps assume that it would not be much over 30 cm., in which case anything up to fifteen lines of writing are now lost. The writing, which is along the fibres on the recto, is a rather large and loose cursive. The formation of the letters is haphazard, initial letters being not merely enlarged but often eccentrically so (e.g. the δ at the beginning of lines 12 and 18 and the λ of line 16). In addition the scribe was apt to let his pen run dry, making it necessary for him to re-write the last few letters when he had taken a fresh supply, so that in these passages the papyrus has somewhat the appearance of a palimpsest. The papyrus may be assigned with practical certainty to the end of the Ptolemaic period; not only is the general style of the hand close to that of the documents published in BGU, VIII, but there are one or two of them — noticeably 1768, 1826, 1764, 1846 — which present a striking resemblance to the graphic peculiarities of our text.¹

¹ Dr. Schubart very kindly pointed out this resemblance; he regards the attribution of the text, on palaeographical grounds, to the late Ptolemaic period as

Abbreviations have been extended; in the papyrus the last letter before the abbreviation is usually placed above the line, except where otherwise indicated in the notes.

II. TEXT AND TRANSLATION

P. Lond. 2710

25.3 × 18 cm.

Recto

Ὡρίων Ἀρυώτου ἀγγελ() αἰ . .
τριάκοντα δύο / λβ

ἀγαθῇ τύχη.

νόμος ὃν ἔθεντο [κα]τὰ κοινὸν οἱ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Διὸς Ὑψίστου συνόδου τοῦτον εἶναι κύριον,

5 καὶ ποιοῦντες καθὶ διαγ[ορ]εῦει πρῶτον μὲν προχειρισάμενοι ἐπ' ἑαυτῶν ἡγούμενον Πετεσοῦ[χον] Ὑεφβένιος, ἄνδρα λόγιον, τοῦ τόπου καὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν

ἄξιον, εἰς ἐ[ν]αυτὸν [ἀπὸ τοῦ] προ[γ]εγ[ρ]αμένου μηνὸς καὶ ἡμέρας συνεισ-

φ[ό]ρ[οι]ς δὲ πᾶσι π[οι]εῖσθ[ε] κατὰ μῆνα πόσι[ν] μίαν ἃ ἐν τῷ τοῦ Διὸς ἱερῷ ἐν αἷς ἐν ἀνδ[ρῶνι] κοινῷ σπένδοντες εὐχέσθωισαν καὶ τᾶλλα τὰ νο-

10 μίζ[ο]μεν[α] ὑπὲρ τε τ[ο]ῦ θεο[ῦ] καὶ κυρίου (ν) βασιλέως· ὑπακούσιν δὲ πάντας τοῦ τε ἡγουμέ-

νου καὶ τ[οῦ] τοῦτον ὑπηρέτου ἐν τε ταῖς ἀνήκουσι τῷ κοινῷ καὶ παρέ-
σονται ἐπὶ τᾶ[ς]

δοθει[σομ]ένας αὐτοῖς παραγγελίας καὶ [σ]υνλόγους καὶ συναγωγὰς καὶ ἀποδημί[ας]

καὶ μ[η]ιδ[ε]νὶ αὐτῶν ἐξέστωι συντευματαρχήσιν μηδὲ σχήματα συνί-
στασ[θαι]

μηιδ' ἀπ[ο]χωρήσιν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ ἡγ[ο]υμένου φράτρας εἰς ἑτέραν φράτραν

15 καὶ μὴ γ[ε]ναλογ[ή]σιν ἕτερος τὸν ἕτερον ἐν τῷ συμποσίῳ μηδὲ κακο-
λογ[ή]σιν ἕτερος [τὸν] ἕτερον ἐν τῷ συμποσίῳ μηδὲ λαλήσιν μη-

quite certain. Dr. Schubart has helped us in other ways. Our warmest thanks are due to him, and to Professor Wilcken and Dr. Bell for their help in the reading of the text; to the Trustees of the British Museum for permission to publish the papyrus; to the late Professor F. Ll. Griffith and to Professors Edgerton and Glanville and Sir Herbert Thompson for help on the Egyptology; and to Professors A. E. R. Boak, Campbell Bonner, W. M. Calder, Franz Cumont, W. S. Ferguson, R. Marcus, M. P. Nilsson, A. Plassart, H. J. Rose, W. L. Westermann, Dr. K. Hanell, Dr. M. N. Tod, Dr. W. W. Tarn, Mr. M. V. Anastos, Mr. M. P. Charlesworth, Mr. C. F. Edson, Jr., Mr. R. P. Hinks, Mr. H. M. Last, and Mr. C. T.

libations, pray, and perform the other customary rites on behalf of the god and lord, the king. All are to obey the president and his servant in matters pertaining to the corporation, and they shall be present at all command occasions to be prescribed for them and at meetings and assemblies and outings. It shall not be permissible for any one of them to or to make factions or to leave the brotherhood of the president for another, or for men to enter into one another's pedigrees at the banquet or to abuse one another at the banquet or to chatter or to indict or accuse another or to resign for the course of the year or again to bring the drinkings to nought or to hinder the (leader?) . . . contributions and other (?) levies and shall each pay . . . If any of them becomes a father, (he shall contribute? . . .).

III. COMMENTARY

On grounds of writing the text is ascribed to the end of the Ptolemaic age: the wording of line 10 (note ad loc.) confirms this and suggests a time in the reign of Ptolemy Auletes, perhaps one between 69 and 58 B.C. The chief representatives of this period among the papyri are the documents published by W. Schubart and D. Schäfer from the archives of Heracleopolis.² They are marked by a certain clumsiness of style, notably an inclination to use participles for finite verbs, an awkwardness of construction,³ and a liking for neologisms.

This is the law of an association and as such is unique among the Greek records so far published from Egypt.⁴ It is a copy or draft and not the original; so much is shown by l. 7, 'the aforementioned month and day,' which refers to a dating which has not here been given, and which is in fact regularly prefixed in the Demotic parallels quoted later.⁵ Individual

² BGU, VIII.

³ The abrupt shifts of mood and tense in our text (infinitive, future, imperative) are paralleled in earlier Greek laws relating to priesthoods, e.g. SIG, 1003, 1009-1012, 1016 (Iasos, 4th cent. B.C.; at the beginning of this there is an analogy for the δὲ of l. 10; κατὰ τὰδε ἱεράσθω ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Μεγίστου. λαμβανέτω δὲ (. . .).

⁴ The fragment from Magdola (82 later) includes regulations, as does SB, 4549; OGI, 130 refers to a new foundation, but is a dedication. Professor A. E. R. Boak has kindly communicated a provisional text of P. Mich. 2710 — the nomos of a gild of the freedmen of Claudius resident at Tebtunis providing for the election of a ἡγούμενος for a year (the fourth of Claudius). It shows striking similarities to our text.

⁵ Cf. pp. 80 f. later.

members needed copies, and a copy was liable to be abbreviated; this may account in part for the harshness of the phrasing.⁶ But the date would matter to a member, and this may therefore be a draft kept by an official of the club and used by him for the making of notes.

The law of such a society, in Egypt as in Greece, was in the nature of a contract by which members bound themselves,⁷ and under Philopator a woman made a petition to obtain redress for the failure of a thiasos to render what was due to her dead brother: the strategos directed the local official to examine the law of the thiasos and compel the performance of what was due.⁸ The state had a certain interest in the conduct of such societies, since gilds commonly imposed on offending members fines payable to the king as well as fines payable to themselves. Furthermore, an edict of Euergetes II in the year 124 B.C. makes provision in regard to the property of institutions,⁹ but there is no evidence for state interference in their concerns till we come to Roman times,¹⁰ and no indication of any registration of these private statutes; had it existed, the petitioner just mentioned would hardly have failed to refer to it. Gild agreements were not treated like ordinary contracts which related to buying and selling, nor was the terminology of such contracts applied to them.¹¹ We can only conjecture that an

⁶ Cf. P. Mich. Tebt. 121 recto 2. ii, 1, τῷ προγεγραμμένῳ ἡμῶν νιῷ Διονυσίῳ, in an abstract in which Dionysius has not been mentioned. Cf. H. Thompson, A family archive from Siut, from papyri in the British Museum, including an account of a trial before the Laocritae of the year B.C. 170, 1, 59, where the names of the witnesses are omitted in a copy of the material parts of the deed. W. F. Edgerton, Münch. Beitr. z. Pap. u. ant. Rechtsgesch., 19, 1934, 299 ff., remarks that some older Egyptian legal documents are not full texts but abstracts or even ex parte statements.

⁷ Cf. M. san Nicolò, EPHITMBION Heinrich Swoboda dargebracht, 284, 296 ff.

⁸ Guéraud, P. Enteuxeis, 1, 20 (pp. 53 ff.).

⁹ P. Tebt. 700.37.

¹⁰ The edict of Philopator (C. Cichorius, Römische Studien, 21), ordering those who initiated for Dionysus to come to Alexandria and deposit their sacred books under seal, is a measure regulating not associations but self-ordaining ministers of the type discussed by Nock, Conversion, 28 ff., 277. At Talmis in the fifth century of our era the king names officials of the synodoi for Isis (Otto, Priester u. Tempel, I. 251 n. 2), but this is outside Egypt.

¹¹ For this cf. Mitteis, Grundz., 47 ff. and SB, 6704, in which huntsmen of

official copy was kept in the archives of the society — in its own buildings when it had them, in a public temple when, as here, that was used (and then possibly as an inscription).

1-2. Cf. pp. 54 ff. later for discussion.

4. *νόμος* is used freely of the agreed customs of associations, as also even of dinner parties; it usually denotes statute rather than code and does not imply a single exhaustive ordinance (San Nicolò, *EPIT.*, 267). In P. Mich. Tebt. 123 recto vi 18 *ν(όμος) συνόδου* is explained by Boak as the *grammatikon* paid for preparing the *nomos*: cf. 124 recto ii 23.

τοῦτον εἶναι κύριον. Laws or contracts commonly included the equivalent of this; in some gilds there was a penalty for proposing change.

5. *καὶ ποιῶντες καθὶ διαγορεύει* (sc. *ὁ νόμος*¹²). We might put a strong stop after *διαγορεύει* and translate 'and, what is more, acting as it orders,' for both *καὶ* and the participle are used in a very free way.¹³ But it seems preferable to put a strong stop after *συνόδου* and no more than a comma after *διαγορεύει*; then *πρῶτον μὲν* is used as though *δεύτερον δέ* or *εἶτα δέ* were to follow. The association is formed for a single year (pp. 79 ff. later); the underlying agreement is 'We shall meet for a year to do certain things under a president x, who is to be designated in due course.' The initiative comes from the association; Petesuchos is not a founder.^{13a} So in P. Dem. Cairo 31178.7, 30605.24, regulations are made for a similar association to last a year and there is a fine for a man who refuses when asked to be president.

προχειρισάμενοι is a regular verb for a designation of an individual to perform particular functions, whether he is designated by govern-

Aphrodito in 538 A.D. made a contract with their accepted leaders. The laws of associations are not 'agrapha,' for agreements so described imply the existence of 'engrapha,' instruments achieving the same purpose with full formality. The normal basis of associations lies in something like the Solonian law quoted by Gaius in the Digest 47.22.4, *ἐὰν δὲ δῆμος ἢ φράτορες ἢ ἱερῶν ὀργίων ἢ ναῦται ἢ σύσσιτοι ἢ ὁμόταφοι ἢ θιασῶται ἢ ἐπὶ λείαν οἰχόμενοι ἢ εἰς ἐμπορίαν, ὅτι ἂν τούτων διαβῶνται πρὸς ἀλλήλους, κύριον εἶναι, ἐὰν μὴ ἀπαγορεύσῃ δημόσια γράμματα*.

¹² Cf. C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence of the Hellenistic period*, 324; P. Tebt. 780.12.

¹³ Cf. H. Ljungvik, *Zur Syntax der spätgriechischen Volkssprache* (Skr. hum. Vetenskap.-Samf. i Uppsala. 27, iii, 1932), 45 on the use of *καὶ* to couple a participle and a finite verb; E. Mayser, *Grammatik*, 2, iii, 22, 203, on loose usage of the participle.

^{13a} Such as the society of Harsamtus at Dendera had; n. 112 later. In P. Mich. Inv. 1277 the members, who select a president, are thus introduced; *κληθέντες ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτῷ ὁ οἰπογεγραμμένοι ἄνδρες*.

ment authority or by an association as in P. Mich. Inv. 1277.4, *προχειρίσε τινὰ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἄνδρα ἀγαθόν*; it can mean 'impress into service,' as in P. Cairo Zen, 59042.3 (257 B.C.). It admits of a following infinitive, as in SIG, 601.5 (193 B.C.) *προχειρισθεὶς καὶ ὑφ' ὑμῶν πρεσβεῦσαι*. We assume therefore that in l. 8 *ποιείσθε* stands for *ποιεῖσθαι*, assuming a vowel error, which while not common in Ptolemaic papyri, is found in them (E. Mayser, *Grammatik*, 1, 107). This leaves *δὲ* (if correctly read) in the air: it is sometimes inserted in an apodosis without logical grounds (A. Wilhelm, *Symb. Oslo*, 13, 1934, 6 f.) and is used after a participial clause — without there being a genuine antithesis of correlated words or clauses (Mayser, *Grammatik*, 2, iii, 126, 132 f.). Here the sense requires direct dependence on the participle, for which we lack a parallel: but *δέ* is used so freely that it may be right.

6. *ἡγούμενον*. Used of the leader of a village or occupational association in Egypt,¹⁴ as also of other persons in civil or military authority and for the heads of priestly colleges. For its application to a religious synodos, cf. P. Mich. Tebt. 127 i 20 (45/6 A.D.) *ἡγο(υμένων) (πέμπτου) (έτους) συνόδο(υ) θεοῦ*; P. Mich. Inv. 1277.

Τεεφβέννιος. On this name the late Professor F. Ll. Griffith kindly wrote "I do not think there is much doubt about it. *τεε-* as a prefix stands for *Je-ho*, and *φβεννις* must be 'the phoenix,' 'the heron,' or possibly 'the swallow.' *Je* means 'saith' and *ho* 'face,' and the meaning in such collocations must be 'the face (of the child) betrays the (Horus) hawk, (Thoth) ibis' etc. according to circumstances. *φβεννις* is less common than *φβηκίς* 'the hawk (of Horus).'" Cf. P. Tebt. 90.36 *Πετεσοῦχος Τεεφμε()*; *Θεαβεννις* in an unpublished B. M. papyrus (Inv. No. 1581); also perhaps the mutilated [. . .] *βεννην* in P. Lond. 880 (vol. 3 p. 9; 113 B.C.).

λόγιον. This epithet has a certain width of range, such as we might expect in a derivative of *λόγος*. Its earlier usage suggests 'learned,' its usage in the first century A.D. also 'eloquent,' 'intelligent'; it is vague, like 'a gentleman and a scholar,' 'a literary man.' Cf. Rhetorius in Cat. cod. astr. graec. 8, iv, 184.10 *λογίους πεπαιδευμένους*, 178.17 *λογίους μὲν πάνυ ποιεῖ καὶ φίλους βασιλέων ἢ τυράννων*, and E. Orth, *Logios*. Professor Edgerton remarks that the usual phrase for 'virtuous man' in the Insinger papyrus means literally 'wise man' or 'learned man.' — In an inscription of Ancyra, ca. 124 A.D., praising a benefactor, we read *παιδεία καὶ λόγῳ κοσμοῦντος τὴν μητρόπολιν* (Suppl. epigr. gr. 6.57).

τοῦ τόπου καὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἄξιον. *τόπου* could mean either (1) the town (probably Philadelphia), or (2) the temple or their place of meeting in it. For (1) we might have expected *κώμης* or *πόλεως*, the latter term being sometimes used in Egypt of places which had no technical

¹⁴ Cf. W. L. Westermann, *J. Eg. Arch.* 18, 1932, 23; A. E. R. Boak, *P. Mich. Tebt.* I, p. 71, and index s.v.; BGU, 1615.6 (weavers at Philadelphia; 84 A.D.), U. Wilcken, *Abh. Berlin*, 1933, 6, 37 ff. (Philadelphia, 2nd cent. B.C.).

right to it, although in general men show their awareness of the absence of civic status and corporate dedications assume the form οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς μητροπόλεως and not ἡ μητρόπολις (P. Jouguet, *La vie municipale dans l'Égypte romaine*, 210). τόπος is used strictly to describe a subdivision of a nome, but in practice it has a wide range and can come very near 'city that is not polis,' as in SB, 7337 (41 B.C.), 6 ff. ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐπισημοτάτοις τοῦ νομοῦ τόποις. Further, ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, ἐπὶ (τῶν) τόπων mean 'on the spot,' ἐπὶ τοὺς τόπους 'to the spot,' ἐκ τῶν τόπων 'from the spot.' Apollinaris, writing from Misenum about 200 A.D., says ἐγὼ γὰρ εἰς καλὸν τόπον ἦλθον (J. G. Winter, *Class. Phil.* 22, 1927, 243 f.); and U. Wilcken, *Arch. Pap.* 9, 1928, 87 is probably right in explaining κ.τ. as Misenum; the physical aspect of the place is stressed as in Aeschin. *Epist.* 1.5. which he quotes. Another parallel is Mitteis, *Chrest.* 31, I 10 τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ τόπου χραχύτας (116 B.C.), referring to Diospolis.

In favor of (2) we might refer to the common use of τόπος to denote the place of meeting or landed property belonging to an association (San Nicolò, *Vereinswesen*, 1, 17, 92; 2, 141 f. and SB, 7290; outside Egypt, Keil-von Premerstein, *Dritte Reisebericht* (*Denkschr. Wien*, 57, 1, 1914) no. 95), or to a politeuma (Lefebvre, *Ann. Serv. Ant.* 13, 1913, 88 ff.). Professor R. Marcus has drawn attention to its common use in the Apocrypha to denote the temple at Jerusalem (without epithet), as also in 2 Macc. 1. 14 of the temple of Nanaia: it is used also of a synagogue (Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber sit*, 81, ii, p. 458 M; perhaps in an inscription at Gaza, Clermont-Ganneau, *Rec. arch. orient.*, 4, 140). But our association did not own a shrine, and, in any case, since neither the community nor the place of meeting has yet been mentioned, the first would be understood rather more easily than the second.

(1) is therefore more probable, and our faith in it is strengthened by a decree of the Athenians resident in Delos in 147/6 B.C., praising a gymnasiarch who κατὰ τὸν [τῆς ἀρχῆς] χρόνον ἀνεστράφη φιλοδόξως καὶ ἀξίως τοῦ τε τόπου καὶ τ[ῆς] τοῦ] δήμου προαιρέσεως (F. Durrbach, *Choix d'inscriptions de Délos*, 1, 131 ff. no. 82; for date cf. W. S. Ferguson, *Athenian tribal cycles*, 145 ff.). For the Athenian group their place of residence was τόπος and not πόλις.

Such a religious society had local feeling and a measure of local standing. In any case, the neighborhood had a considerable strength of communal feeling in antiquity, as in Germany down to modern times (L. Radermacher, SB, *Wien*, 187, 3, 1918, 3 ff.), and its unity in Egypt was to some extent a unity in relation to temples.

τῶν ἀνδρῶν more dignified than ἐαυτῶν.

ἀξιον suggests the language of acclamations; cf. SIG, 1109. 36. In laudatory inscriptions ἀξίως is commoner than ἄξιον (for which, however, cf. *Suppl. epigr. gr.*, 7.825), but that is because praise is

usually accorded for conduct in a particular capacity, described in a verbal phrase; here the duties lie in the future.

7. *εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν*. The whole life of the club as formally contemplated; pp. 79 ff. later.

συνεισφόροις is possible but doubtful; for it cf. P. Flor. 18. 25 (147/8 A.D.); SB, 4284.11 (207 A.D.); 7337.26 (41 B.C.) of contributing to expenses or exactions.

8. *πόσιν*. Cf. P. Mich. Inv. 1277.15; BGU, 1191.3 (11 B.C.) *πόσιν δ' ἐκ πόσεως ἀπὸ Ἀθῦρ ε . . . ὑποδεκνύμενον*; SB, 7457.17 (text discussed later on l. 12); p. 80 later. The meetings of the Sarapiastae on Thasos were called *κώθωνες* from the name of a drinking vessel (2nd cent. B.C.: H. Seyrig, BCH, 51, 1927, 220). Some food was naturally consumed at these functions; in P. Ryl. Zen. 15 (edited by C. C. Edgar, Bull. Ryl. Libr., 18, 1934, 127) plates are ordered for *οἱ πίνοντες*.

9. *ἀνδρῶνι* is employed in the papyri to denote any livingroom in a house, which may have as many as four, while *συμπόσιον* refers to the dining room, commonly upstairs (Fr. Luckhard, *Das Privathaus im ptolemäischen u. römischen Ägypten*, Diss. Bonn, 1914 [printed at Giessen], 39, 66 f.): elsewhere *ἀνδρῶν* is used of a corridor by Plin. Ep. 2.17.22, of a diningroom by Plut. Q. G. 57, p. 303E (at Samos: probably banqueting hall); and Vitruvius 6. 7.5: so perhaps *ἀνδρῶν* and *ἀνδρώνιον* in P. Roussel, *Inscriptions de Délos*, 356 bis (repeatedly in list of leases). In Excavations at Dura-Europos, Fifth Report, edited by M. Rostovtzeff and C. Hopkins, 113 ff., we have as no. 418 an inscription of 54 A.D. *ἔτους ἐξτ' Γορπιαίου κ' οἱ ὑπογεγραμμένοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐταιρείας ἀνήγειραν τὸν ἀνδρῶνα τοῦτον Ἀπαλάδῳ θεῷ κτλ.* Hopkins in his commentary suggests that *ἀνδρῶν* seems to define more clearly the *ιερόν*, the dedication of which is mentioned in the inscription accompanying the bas-relief which shows the god (p. 112, no. 416) and quotes a text from Gerasa (A. H. M. Jones, JRS, 20, 1930, 43 = Suppl. epigr. gr., 7.841), which mentions a gift for an *ἀνδρῶν*, the use of which is not specified — any more than is that of the *ἀνδρῶν* in Suppl. epigr. gr. 7.171 from Palmyra, or of another at Me'ez in Djebel Bārīsha, ib. 71 (129 A.D.), though from the fact of its having been restored as a benefaction to the kome it is clear that it was some sort of room for common social purposes (R. Mousterde, *Mélanges Beyrouth*, 15, 1931, 301. M. Rostovtzeff, p. 14 of *La Syrie romaine*, offprinted from *Revue historique*, 175, 1935 translates 'clubs.') Both Dura texts were deposited in the same niche, and the text accompanying the bas-relief ascribes the dedication to Adadiabos, who is one of the members of the *ἐταιρεία*. Is it possible that Adadiabos met the expenses of the dedicatory ceremonies (for which cf. Cumont, Fouilles, 409)? It may be suggested that the *ἀνδρῶν* is not the *ιερόν* but one of the buildings in the precinct. So at Segesta an *ἀνδρεῶν* appears to have been one of the buildings in a precinct (CIG, 5545 = Collitz-Bechtel, *Samml. griech. Dialektinschriften*,

5190; an inscription edited by P. Marconi, *Not. scavi*, 1931. 397ff., mentions *οἱ ἀνδρεῶνες*; both texts are of the third century B.C.). In Josephus, *AJ*, 16.164 *ἀνδρῶν* is a room used in connection with the synagogue; cf. S. Krauss, *Synagogale Altertümer*, 25. [Dr. M. N. Tod has kindly supplied some references for this note.]

κοινῶ should mean 'belonging to the association': it may be that they hired it, as *pastophoria* or houses in temple precincts were hired for a period. For the attribution to private organisations of places in temples cf. p. 78 later.

We have assumed that *ἐν αἷς* means *ἐν αἷς πόσειν* 'on the occasion of which drinkings,' and that *ā* stands after *μίαν* as a synonymous sign. Professor Wilcken has raised a serious objection that the stroke over the *ā* ought to make it an ordinal; further, there is a gap before it as large as that before *ὑπακούσειν*, and this should mean a transition. He therefore proposes to treat *ā* as meaning *πρώταις*, and to read *ἔναις*, assuming *ἐνη* to mean *ἐνη καὶ νέα*, the last day of the month. The association would be meeting on the first day of the month in the temple of Zeus and on the last day of the month in their andron, perhaps alternately 85 for it is expressly stated that there is to be one drinking a month. It is hard to dissent from Professor Wilcken, and the stylistic peculiarities of the text make a decision peculiarly difficult, but: (1) there seems to be no clear parallel for *ἐνη* in the sense of *ἐνη καὶ νέα*.¹⁵ In Hesiod *Works and Days* 770 it means 'the first of the month';¹⁶ in Attic we have *εἰς ἐνην* meaning 'till the day after tomorrow,' but, it seems, no other use of *ἐνη* alone;¹⁷ (2) even in our abbreviated text the habit of alternating meeting places ought surely to be stated clearly, as in *SB*, 7457 (later p. 51) and *P. Dem. Cairo* 30619; (3) the use of letters of the alphabet with a transverse bar above them as cardinal numerals is extremely common in the third cent. B.C. and though later unusual is far from unexampled; e.g., *P. Oxy.* 255 (48 A.D.); (4) the space on either side of the numeral is usual; (5) the construction becomes even harsher. If we do not

¹⁵ Professor Nilsson and Dr. Hanell have kindly confirmed this, finding for *ἐνη* only *IG*, 1 (ed. 2), 4 l. 19 (455/4 B.C.), *τὰ[ς] ἡέν]ας ἐμέρας* / [*τὰς* πρὸ *τές* νο]μενίας: this is a restoration and, if it is right, it must be noticed that the meaning of *ἡένας* is made clear by the words which follow.

¹⁶ Cf. T. A. Sinclair's note ad loc.

¹⁷ Philochorus fr. 181: *Φιλόχορος δὲ ἐν τῷ περὶ ἡμερῶν 'Ἡλίου καὶ 'Απόλλωνος λέγει αὐτήν* (sc. *τὴν ἐνην*) has been quoted as evidence that the *ἐνη* must have been the last day of the month in the time of Philochorus. But this fragment comes from the note of Proclus on Hesiod, *Works*, 768, which begins *ΠΡΩΤΟΝ ΕΝΗ ΤΕΤΡΑΣ ΤΕ. ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς γεννήσεως*; then comes the sentence quoted, and then remarks on the fourth day and the seventh. It is therefore possible that Phil. said *τὴν πρώτῃν ἡμέραν*; the note of Proclus was concerned with subject matter and not with language. One must not press the point, but he did not say *καὶ οὐχ, ὥς ἔθος, ἡ ἐσχάτη ἡμέρα τοῦ μηνός*.

therefore accept this suggestion, there remains the problem created by the gap; perhaps this can be explained as due to carelessness.

σπένδοντες εὐχέσθωσαν. Cf. Wilken, Chr. 41 ii 11 (232 A.D.; referring to Kaisareion and gymnasium at Elephantine) σπονδά[ς τε καὶ δε]ήσεις ποιησάμενος; BGU, 646.21 (193 A.D.: mentioned to Alexandrians as appropriate for them). The libation was of particular importance in domestic life, where it followed the deipnon or meal proper, taking substantial proportions when men met together for a subsequent symposion (p. 85 later). Prayer at this point is mentioned by Xenophan. 1. 15 (Diels, Vorsokratiker, ed. 3, 1.55); Menand. ap. Athen. 14 p. 659 D-E; Machon ib. 8 p. 349 C; Aristas 184. In any case the traditional paean and hymns were of the nature of prayer; cf. Theophrast. ap. Athen. 15 p. 693 D ὥσπερ ἱκετείαν τινὰ ποιούμενοι τοῦ θεοῦ μὴθὲν ἀσχημονεῖν. To pass outside the range of private habits, Hermias ib. 4 p. 149 D-F describes communal meals taken by the men of Naucratis on three holidays; wearing white garments they met in the prytaneum, reclined, rose on their knees while the herald recited the traditional prayers, joined him in a libation, reclined again, and received their wine and food.

καὶ τᾶλλα τὰ νομιζόμενα (sc. ποιῶσι). Cf. Plato Symp. p. 176 A σπονδάς τε σφᾶς ποιήσασθαι καὶ ἄσαντας τὸν θεὸν καὶ τᾶλλα τὰ νομιζόμενα τρέπεσθαι πρὸς τὸν πότον. Such phrases seem to be almost stereotyped in Egypt; cf. OGI, 56.40 (Canopus inscription); 90.48 (Rosetta stone); SB, 7259 (95/4 B.C.), 6152 (93 B.C.), 6153 (93 B.C.); Wilken, Chr. 70.9 (57/6 B.C.); W. Spiegelberg, Demotische Denkmäler, 3, 21 f. no. 50048 (217 B.C.): τὰ νομιζόμενα SB, 6154 (69 B.C.), 6236 (70 B.C.). τᾶλλα could naturally include the offering of incense (in BGU, 388 ii 22 [2nd/3rd cent. A.D.; Fayum] a spondeion and a thymiaterion are mentioned as part of the furniture of a triklinon), possibly also the setting out of sacrificial gifts and lighting of lamps (as in a text relating to an association of the 2nd century B.C., edited by U. Wilken, Abh. Berlin, 1933, 6, 38 f.).

10. ὑπέρ τε τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου βασιλέως. τε is displaced; cf. OGI, 219.16 πρότερόν τε . . . καὶ νῦν, where τε and καὶ are not in parallel clauses and τε is not strictly used; also BGU, 1835.7 (51/0 B.C.) ὑπέρ τε σοῦ καὶ τῶν τέκνων where τε may, however, be due to ellipse of ὑπέρ before τῶν τέκνων.

For the custom of prayer etc. for the king, cf. A. Alföldi, Röm. Mitt., 49, 1934, 86 f.; for the various days monthly kept in his honor, W. Schmidt, Geburtstag im Altertum, 54 ff.; for earlier precedent (on behalf of the Persian governor of Judaea), A. Cowley, Aramaic papyri of the fifth century B.C., 114 and R. H. Pfeiffer, State Letters of Assyria, 166 no. 233. In BGU, 1768 the strategos makes sacrifice and libation for the king and for the dioecetes.

The title 'god and lord' is of interest, for it does not appear to be

found earlier than Auletes. In P. Bouriant 12 (88 B.C.) we have τὸν μέγιστον θεόν of Soter, but in BGU, VIII we have θ. κ. κ. β. four times; 1764.8 διὰ τὴν τύχην τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου βασιλέως; 1789.3 τοῦ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου βασ(ιλέως) and the plural τῶν θεῶν καὶ κυρίων βασιλέων in 1834.7 (51/0 B.C.) and 1845.5; in 1838.1 (51/0 B.C.) an official is described τῷ θεοτάτῳ καὶ κυρίῳ στρατηγῷ; thereafter we find of Augustus in P. Oxy. 1143 (ca. A.D. 1) θυ]σίας καὶ σπονδὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου αὐτοκράτορος, and the phrase recurs in BGU, 1200.11 (2/1 B.C.) and is used of an official under Augustus in BGU, 1201 (restoration τῷ θεῷ[ι καὶ κυρί]ῳ is likely enough). Thereafter it disappears; Claudius is θεός in the preamble added by the governor to his letter to the Alexandrians, but κύριος is the term which survived.¹⁸ 'God and lord' was at no time an official Ptolemaic title¹⁹ and does not figure in datings; it belongs to the style of formal compliment and is to be compared with the wide range of honorific epithets and terms used in petitions and studied by P. Collomp, *Recherches sur la chancellerie et la diplomatie des Lagides*, 96 ff.

The king is commonly mentioned alone in texts referring to taxation and the like; but in an honorific context such as this it is usual to refer to his consort (e.g. P. Gurob 10.5 f.) and common to refer to his children. Since we are dealing with a copy and not with an original, it is safest not to press the point; but it may be suggested that the text falls during the period from 69 to 57 in which documents do not mention the queen,²⁰ and probably before 58, when the king went into exile (returning in 55).

11. ὑπηρέτου. An assistant is common in cult societies; but his important position here falls in line with an Egyptian analogy considered later (p. 79 n. 154).

ἀνήκουσι commonly with εἰς, πρὸς; for the dative cf. SB, 7361.9 (211/2 A.D.).

τῷ κοινῷ common title of association; used in SB, 7457.15 of the 'fellow-farmers,' previously described as a σύννοδος.

παρέσονται ἐπὶ. Cf. P. Lond. 358.18 (2 p. 172; ca. 150 A.D.).

¹⁸ H. Linssen, *Jahrb. f. Liturgiewiss.* 8, 1928, 66, remarks on the absence of dominus deusque from inscriptions.

¹⁹ On coins it appears first under Aurelian and even then only in the products of the mint of Serdica (Mattingly-Sydenham-Webb, *Roman Imperial Coinage*, 5.1.258 f.; Fr. Sauter, *Der römische Kaiserkult bei Martial u. Statius*, 33). On κύριος in general cf. now C. C. McCown *Ann. Am. Sch. Or. Res.* 13, 1933, 139 ff. κύριος alone of Auletes in BGU, 1767.1 (prob. after 64/3 B.C.), 1768.9 (undated). In OGI, 186 (62 B.C.) a high official in a proskynema uses the phrase τοῦ κυρίου βασιλέως θεοῦ νέου Διονύσου. Cf. now W. Otto, *Hist. Zeit.* 152, 545 f.

²⁰ The next Cleopatra is just θεά in Preisigke, SB, 1570. It has been assumed that she died; but cf. the warning of H. Gauthier, *Le livre des rois d'Egypte*, 4, 399 n. 1; for the date of the marriage, ib. 393.

12. δοθεισομένα(ι)s. Cf. P. Bouriant 20.2 (after 350 A.D.) τὴν ἐντολὴν τὴν δοθεῖσαν; SIG, 985.12.

παραγγελίας. παραγγέλλω is widely used of the commands of an executive officer, and in Egypt specially of the official summons of the defendant to appear in court; cf. BGU, 1774.12, and D. Schäfer, *Aegyptus*, 13, 1933, 610 ff.

συνλόγους καὶ συναγωγὰς. A doublet in legal fashion; cf. SIG, 526.16 (Itanos; 3rd cent. B.C.). Both terms apply to meetings and to the association as there present. συναγωγή often has also the sense of 'banquet after sacrifice' (Poland, RE, 4 A, 1284 ff.; cf. συναγώγιον as diningroom in Pollux 6.7), as again 'place of meeting' (SB, 4981.6; Alexandria; Ptolemaic date). For the form συνλόγους cf. E. Mayser, *Grammatik*, I. 235 f.

ἀποδημίας. Cf. P. Cairo Zen. 59053.2-3 (257 B.C.) ὑπολαμβάνομεν ἀποδημίαν ἡμῖν παραγγελήσεσθαι. ἀποδημία may refer to a plain picnic (cf. SB, 6319) or to the visiting of convenient temples to make collective proskynemata such as SB, 5803 (Augustan; at Karnak), 4549 (226 A.D.; Talmis; coupled with record of those in arrears with subscriptions). The most instructive parallel for activities of a society outside of its primary place of origin is perhaps afforded by Ev. Brecchia, Bull. r. soc. arch. Alex. 24, N. S. 7, 1929, 66 ff. (SB, 7457), an inscription from Kôm Tukala dateable only as between Ptolemy V and Ptolemy VII. It relates to an assembly of fellow-farmers, συγγεωργοί, who wished to buy a plot of ground whereon to build a gymnasium and house for the doing of sacrifice for their lords. A man called Paris gave it and would not take any money; so they voted him two representations, to be wreathed on the days on which they sacrificed for the royal family, and a day of honor; if he should do them further services, they would add another day in the city, i.e. in Alexandria. Three years later they added two days, so that there were to be three, one in Alexandria, and two in Psenamosis where their farms lay.

13. ἐξέστω. The future infinitive following is a sort of sense construction, perhaps influenced by the vicinity of παρέσονται.

συντ. εὐματαρχήσιν. We perhaps need some word meaning 'seek to be leader of a sub-unit'; συνταγματαρχήσιν, of which we had thought, seems impossible palaeographically and is on other grounds hardly thinkable.

σχίσματα. Probably an error for σχίσματα, used literally by Arist. p. 499a 27, metaphorically in 1 Cor., as was σχίζω earlier (e.g. Xen. Symp. 4.59 of a friendly divergence of opinion). The other possibility is σχήματα. σχῆμα is used of 'position of dignity, status' (M. N. Tod, Cl. Quart. 18, 1924, 101), but seems not to be found in the plural. συνίστασθαι would suit either noun, or any other that could mean 'faction,' 'unit'; so it is used with σύνοδον (OGI, 111.25), δειπνον (Diphil. ap. Athen. 7 p. 292A).

14. *φράτρας*. *φρατρία* and the Ionic *φρήτρη* denote an ancient religious unit at Athens (U. Kahrstedt, *Staatsgebiet u. Staatsangehörige in Athen*, Götting. Forsch., 4, 1934, 243 ff.), and small groups celebrating the Carneia at Sparta (Demetr. Scephs. ap. Athen. 4. p. 141F). Josephus applies it to groups of not less than ten men celebrating the Passover (AJ, 3.248; BJ, 6. 423 ὡσπερ δὲ φατρία). In Asia Minor we find it used as a synonym of *συμβίωσις* to denote societies which drank together, visited the houses of dead members and there dined, celebrated a pannychis for the community, gave oil to the people, and made dedications (Poland, *Vereinswesen*, 52 f.; Keil-von Premerstein, *Zweite Reisebericht* (Denkschr. Wien, 54, 2, 1911), no. 147; Buckler-Calder-Cox, *Monum. Asiae Min. ant.*, 4,230 (Tymandos: 3rd cent. A.D.). Later it can mean conspiracy; cf. Can. 18 Conc. Chalc. (Mansi 7.389).

The presence of the expression here creates a grave difficulty. It cannot relate to civic organisation, for in a Fayum town there was no such organisation, and in any case where there were civic *phratritiae* a man was born into them and could not change them at will. Nor can it well refer to some other type of religious association in the place to which a member might at the same time belong, as in the text cited from Keil and von Premerstein, where it existed side by side with a (Dionysiac) *speira*, and the dead man had his place in both. Nor can it well be a subunit of the society,²¹ for why should a man wish to leave that of the president, which was presumably the most honored? The solution seems to be that *φράτρα* is here used as an equivalent for *σύνοδος*, simply for the sake of variety and the pleasure of using a more uncommon word.²² There was no doubt a multiplicity of similar organisations, as at Oxyrhynchus as late as 426 A.D. (Wilcken, Chr., 123) and at Talmis in the same period, where there were three (Wilcken, Arch. Pap., 1, 1901, 411 ff.). The practice of drinking together limited effective membership; the Demotic lists indicate not more than 40 members and Poland RE, 4A, 1081 notes that *συμβιώσεις* in Asia Minor on which we have information were small. So in a village in Saxony there were as many as four brotherhoods (M. Beth in Hoffmann-Krayer and Bächtold-Stäubli, *Handw. deutschen Aberggl.* 6.753 ff.).

15. *γενεαλογήσιν*, if right, is a literary word which might be used in such a text for effect. Theophrastus, Char. 28, says that the evil-speaker (ὁ κακολόγος), when asked, Who is so and so, begins *καθάπερ οἱ γενεαλογοῦντες*; this perhaps justifies the word here, but its associations are mainly with something of the Hesiodic mythological type.

²¹ Such as the *αἰρέσεις* of ephebe associations (Wilcken, Chr. 141-2) and possibly of others (Wilcken, Abh. Berlin 1933, 6, 38). Cf. perhaps Dessau, *Inscr. lat. sel.* 7212.25 *ut quisquis seditionis causa de loco in alium locum transierit*.

²² Cf. H. Seyrig, BCH, 51, 1927, 224 on the synonymous use of *ἔτος* and *ἐνιαυτός* side by side in a Thasian text of the second century B.C.

(Xen. Symp. 4.51 has it of a genealogy invented by a man begging help.) In the mixed racial conditions of a Fayum town there were considerable possibilities of unpleasantness arising out of reciprocal considerations of parentage — over and above such normal amenities as Lucilius 119 ed. Marx. We had thought of μηδὲν εὐλογῆσαι which would recall the copious vociferations in the local senate at Oxyrhynchus in A.D. 270/5, e.g. P. Oxy. 1413; praise of one man might provoke another to hostility, and anything like private toasts would disturb the order of proceedings (Alexandrian table-manners were rough, if we may trust Athen. 10 p. 420E), but palaeographically it seems impossible.

14/5 probably refer to conduct during the meetings, 16 to conduct outside them and arising out of them.

συνποσίῳ. This word in papyri of the Roman period commonly means 'diningroom'; but it is clearly 'festival meal' in SB, 1106. (Sebennytyos; Ptolemaic date) οἱ συμπόσιον γεύόμενοι.

16. λαλήσειν. Very curious, for although the verb can have the derogatory connotation 'chatter,' it is usual in a neutral sense to describe speech in general and in particular talk over wine. At the meetings of the Iobacchi at Athens no one was to speak without permission of the priest or the vice-priest, under penalty of fine (SIG, 1109.108); possibly our symposion was to take place with ritual solemnity such as was customary at Naucratis (p. 49 above). But there may be a special Egyptian emphasis in this. The 'negative confession' in the Book of the Dead 125 includes among the dead man's claims of innocence, 'I have not been talkative in speech' (G. Roeder, Urkunden zur Religion des alten Ägypten, 276). At least a summary of this text reached the Greek-speaking world, as we see from Euphantus ap. Porph. De abst. 4.10 (where this clause does not, however, appear). In Corp. Herm. 10.9. the good man possessed of gnosis is ὁ μὴ πολλά λαλῶν μηδὲ πολλά ἀκούων.

The meaning cannot be 'babble about the society's business'; for that would surely have been stated in more explicit terms. Professor Campbell Bonner suggests (κατα)λαλήσειν, 'backbite' which well deserves consideration.

17. κατηγορήσειν means presumably at this point not that no one is to make verbal charges but that no one is to hale a fellow-member into court for anything arising out of their association in the synodos (cf. Plato, Leges, 11, p. 915E), all such causes of offence being under the jurisdiction of the president; in the Demotic parallels there is a fine for so doing; neither here nor in native Greek associations do we find any tendency of the gild to exercise such jurisdiction over other matters (San Nicolò, EMIIT., 262 ff.).^{22a} We have a funerary foundation of the fourth dynasty with a clause forbidding litigation between

^{22a} The prohibition by Paul of appeal to the courts springs from the background of the life of the Judaism of the Dispersion.

members of the priestly college which was concerned with the fulfilment of the founder's wishes, and permitting arbitration (J. Pirenne, *Histoire des institutions du droit privé de l'ancienne Egypte*, l. 175 ff.). For a petition arising out of the alleged failure of a society to render to a dead member his due, cf. p. 43.

ἀπόρρησις. Cf. P. Ryl. 228.13 (1st cent. A.D.) in list of memoranda, translated 'refusal'; OGI, 262.14 (almost 'excuse'); ἀπό(ρ)ρησις as 'denial' in the letter of Artabanus III to Susa in 21 A.D. (Cumont C. R. Ac. Inscr. 1932, 244; C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence*, 300, no. 75.13).

18. τὸν ἐνιαυτόν. The year in question, as in SIG, 227.5 the year covered by the vote, 385.10, the year of ephebeia.

συμποσίας. A byform of συμπόσιον; cf. Pind. P. 4. 294; Aristaeas 203 (two lines after συμπόσιον), 220, 297 Lobeck, Phrynichus, 517 ff. At the end of the line επειπερ could also be read; perhaps a dittography is to be suspected here.

19. We want something like 'will not be disorderly' or 'will not bring in outsiders' (for the village dining clubs discussed later admitted of guests); cf. the *lex familiae Silvani* of 60 A.D. from Monteleone Sabino (R. Paribeni, *Notizie* 1928, 392) 1.7 'ne quis litiget neue rixam faciat neue extraneum inuitet.' Or, as Professor H. J. Rose suggests, ἐμπερεπερεύεσθαι, ἐμπερπερεύσεσθαι, or some other compound of περπερεύομαι, 'be talkative,' 'brag'; perhaps rightly, but such a prohibition should have come a little earlier in this text.

The two letters before *ετεραν* look like τ'; possibly τ(ήν) should be read.

22. A member who became a father had probably to make some extra contribution to the club, as in the Demotic parallels (80 ff. later) and SIG, 1109.130, presumably for a celebration (San Nicolò, *Vereinswesen*, 2.165). In permanent associations there was sometimes an obligation to introduce a son: cf. SIG, 1106.51; Wilcken, *Chr.* 110A; F. Poland, *Philol.* 70, 1911, 524 ff. (Keil-von Premerstein 3 no. 117 implies that a son would normally take the place of his father in a funerary gild, for it is provided that substitutes for 'friends' who die childless may be admitted).

23. Perhaps ὁ ἡγούμενος διοικῆσει.

The Accounts.

We can do little for these. Since the text is in all probability a private copy, they may be regarded as memoranda; perhaps we should accept Professor Wilcken's earlier tentative suggestion and read ἀτελ(ής) αἰ(γῶν), to which he was in part moved by the absence of the usual sign for drachmae. But Professor Westermann draws attention to its absence in the club accounts published by Edgar, *Raccolta Lumbroso*, 373 ff. and P. Teb. 224. It is not absolutely

necessary to suppose that the memoranda have anything to do with the group, although the accounts on recto and verso alike appear to be in the same hand as the main text, and ἀτελής is common in connection with clubs in the sense 'not liable to pay contribution.' But Professor Wilcken is now inclined to read ἀγέλ () and we must leave the matter open.

Verso.

With τῆς ἀνὰ χειρὸς, τῆς ἐνεστῶσης, τῆς ἐπὶ χειρὸς we should perhaps supply πόσεως and interpret as 'the one immediately preceding,' 'the present one,' 'the one to come.' ἀνὰ χεῖρα is used in financial statements for current receipts up to date; cf. Preisigke, Wörterbuch, 2.726; P. Ryl. 88.21, 99.7; SB, 7468. 6 f.; PSI, 1043.20 (Arsinoite nome; 103 A.D.) ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀνὰ χῖρα ἐτῶν; ὑπὸ χεῖρα 'the last' in P. Tebt. 287.7. So in P. Tebt. 118 the members of a dining club pay 100 drachmae for each meal which they attend. γ, δ, ρ, may refer to numbered subdivisions of the club like the priestly phylae: Professor Boak kindly informs us that in P. Mich. Inv. 671, which enumerates contributions by members of a gild of Harpocrates at Tebtunis, the names are listed in groups of five: the first has no number, but the rest are numbered β, γ, δ, ε; names are grouped in the Demotic accounts mentioned p. 82 later.

Professor Westermann remarks on these accounts that the regular amount required is 1200 (copper) drachmae and suggests as a possibility in the last line [λοι]π(όν) ρ: i.e. 'Deficit 100 — to make up the 1200. . . kaleibis 1100.'

IV. ZEUS HYP SISTOS

The synodos is to meet in the temple of Zeus Hypsistos. What is this temple? The title Zeus Hypsistos is found at numerous points in the Greek world; so is Theos Hypsistos, and we have occasionally the plain Hypsistos referring to a god. The three are sometimes treated as equivalents. Thus a cult conducted by worshippers (mostly women) of the lower classes at a shrine south of the Pnyx at Athens has left its mark in numerous votive inscriptions of the late first to the third century of our era, accompanied by reliefs representing parts of the body healed by the god. In these we find ὑψίστῳ Διὶ or Διὶ ὑψίστῳ three times, θεῷ ὑψίστῳ twice, ὑψίστῳ eight times, and twice a dedication without divine name.²³ Again, out of four

²³ K. Kourouniotis, H. A. Thompson, *Hesperia*, 1, 1932, 193 ff.; Ph. D. Stavropoulos, *Arch. Delt.*, 13, 1930 (publ. 1933), παρ. 2.

small altars found at Seleucia on the Calycadnus probably coming from one and the same sanctuary, three are inscribed θεῶ ὑψίστῳ, one Διὶ ὑψίστῳ.²⁴ Accordingly, we have to consider Theos Hypsistos as well as Zeus Hypsistos.

The evidence for Hypsistos is presented by A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, 2.876 ff. but it may be convenient to give a summary tabular conspectus with some addenda from later discovery.

Where there is no note added in parentheses the evidence is that of votive inscriptions with no special features.

Ζεὺς ὑψίστος	θεὸς ὑψίστος	Both
Thebes (temple)	Hephaestia in Lemnos (votive altar; 2nd/3rd cent. A.D.)	Athens
Corinth (statue)	Selymbria	Mysia (cult-society for Zeus H., apparently recorded in inscription found at Panormus near Cyzicus) ²⁵
Argos (? priestess, 1st/2nd cent. A.D.) ²⁶	Cerdylon	Miletus (θ. ὕ. has priest and prophetes, Διὸς ὑψίστου inscribed on marble column 1 m. high)

²⁴ J. Keil-A. Wilhelm, *Monum. Asiae min. ant.*, 3. 1-4 (probably 3rd cent. A.D.). Cf. variation elsewhere between Zeus Olbios and Theos Olbios. (Höfer in Roscher *Lex. Myth.*, 3. 329 f., 5. 638; at Panderma near Cyzicus also θεῶ [Δ]ιὶ ὀλβίῳ, F. W. Hasluck, *JHS*, 25, 1905, 56), and the diversity of terminology in various places illustrated by Br. Müller, ΘΕΟΣ ΜΕΓΑΣ (*Diss. Phil. Hal.*, 21, 3, 1913); at Patara we find both θεοῦ σωτήρος ἑδραίου ἀσφαλοῦς and Διὸς σωτήρος ἑδραίου (E. Kalinka, *Tituli Asiae minoris*, II, 2 nos. 403-4; the first is coupled with Poseidon Hedraios and Helios Apollo). Zeus Bronton is familiar; in South Russia we find θεῶ βροντῶντι ἐπηκόῳ ἢ πατρὶς Κοιτειῶν τὸν ναόν (*Suppl. epigr. gr.*, 2.481; 234 A.D.), that is, the use of the form with theos in a public dedication.

²⁵ Dated before Christian era by P. Perdrizet, *BCH*, 23, 1899, 592, in 2nd cent. A.D. more probably by Cook, *op. cit.* 882. (Mr. R. P. Hinks is inclined to date ca. 200 A.D. on grounds of style.) Cf. Perdrizet, *l.c.*, for other texts from this region which he refers to the same sodality, one including the phrase ἐν τῇ τοῦ Διὸς συναγωγῇ, dated in 93/4 A.D., if the Sullan era was used, ca. 114/5 if the Pompeian [a fact due to Dr. M. N. Tod's kindness]. E. Ziebarth, *Ath. Mitt.* 30, 1905, 145 f., doubts, with reason, whether the texts do so refer, but they are kindred.

²⁶ Unless ὑψίστου in Kaibel, *Epigr. gr.* 465 = IG, 4.620 is a poetical epithet. This curious poem shows a special pious devotion.

Ζεὺς ὑψίστος	θεὸς ὑψίστος	Both
Olympia (2 altars)	Serdica (cult association; time of Tiberius)	Phoenicia (both in inscriptions: evidence of Philo of Byblus who speaks of "ὑψίστος and ὁ ὑψίστος without θεός)
Edessa (including cult association, 51 A.D.) ²⁷	Sarmizegetusa. ²⁸ Another site in Moesia (altar)	Thessalonica ^{28a}
Imbros	Rome (round base;? found there)	
Anchialos	Cyprus (votives by people who had been healed)	
Philippopolis ²⁹	Cos	Delos. (a) 1st cent. B.C. dedications to Theos Hypsistos, probably from a proseucha ³⁰
Corcyra		(b) prayers to Theos Hypsistos for ven-

²⁷ S. Pelekides, *Arch. Delt.*, 8, 1923 (publ. 1925), 268 f. For three other dedications to Z. H. from Edessa, cf. W. Baege, *De Macedonum sacris* (Diss. phil. Hal., 22, 1, 1913), 8. Duchesne-Bayet, *Arch. miss. scient.* 3.3, 1876, p. 248, no. 84, publish a dedication from Thessalonica [ἡ συνήθεια [τῶν] περὶ 'Αλέ[ξανδρ]ον Διὸς . . ου αρ. Papageorgiu, *ΑΘΗΝΑ*, 15, 1903, 46, n. 14, reads 'Αλέξιον, a less likely name in Macedon (as Mr. Edson remarks) and then Διὸς θεοῦ ἀρχισυνάγωγον. Here Δ.θ., like θεῶ Δι at Tralles (Cook 958), suggests a foreign god bearing the name of Zeus. 'Ὑψίστου is a better supplement, but we could read Κτησίου or Ὑπάτου etc.

²⁸ C. Daicovici, *Anuarul Cluj*, 1928-32, 1, 85 no. 3, θεῶ ὑψίστῳ ἐπὶ κῶφῳ εὐχαριστοῦσα ἀνέθηκ(εν) Αἰλία Κασσία; another instance (θεῶ ὕ.) cited by him, ib.

^{28a} (1) Zeus Hypsistos: relief of 'the just goddess Nemesis' dedicated to him, presumably in a shrine (W. Kubitschek, *Jahrb. f. Altertumskunde*, 4, 1910, 147 ff.; P. Perdrizet, *BCH*, 38, 1914, 89 ff.; bought at Thessalonica and may well come thence).

(2) dedication to Theos Hypsistos: Avezou-Picard, *BCH*, 37, 1913, 100; cf. p. 65 later.

²⁹ R. Cagnat, *Rev. arch.*, 5th Ser. 20, 1924, 47 f.

³⁰ A. Plassart, *Mélanges Holleaux*, 201 ff.; *Revue biblique*, N. S. 11, 1914, 523 ff. (θ. ὕ. 3 times, ὕ. once; one dedication, without the name of the deity, by a slave who has become free).

Ζεὺς ὑψίστος	θεὸς ὑψίστος	Both
		geance, with Jewish coloring (c) precinct-wall and altars set up to Zeus Hypsistos on Mount Cynthus, near other Semitic shrines ³¹
Ζεὺς ὑψίστος	θεὸς ὑψίστος	
Iasos (boundary-stone; therefore from precinct) ³² Lagina Panamara Mylasa (priest of Z. H. and Agathe Tyche) ³⁵ Stratonicea (Antonine age) ³⁶ Palmyra ³⁷ and on road thence to Emesa S. of Damascus Gerizim (evidence of Damascius)	Pergamon Tralles (small altar) Lydia, <i>passim</i> (altars: votive eagle at Thyatira) ³³ Lesbos (one not before Trajan; one θεῷ κεραυνίῳ ὑψίστῳ) Phrygia, <i>passim</i> (altars) ³⁴ Bithynia (?) (base) Paphlagonia (cult society; οἱ ἀδελφοί) Oenoanda (record of votive lamp) Termessus (votive foot of god) ³⁸ Patara ³⁹ Pontus ⁴⁰	

³¹ A. Plassart, *Exploration de Délos*, 11, 289 ff.

³² E. L. Hicks, *JHS*, 8, 1887, 115 suggests that the cult may be identical with that of Zeus Megistos.

³³ For this cf. now Cumont, *Cat. Cinquantenaire*, ed. 2, 67 f.

³⁴ Add a dedication at Apamea ad Maeandrum, *Suppl. epigr. gr.* 6.266.

³⁵ A new dedication to Z. H. in *Suppl. epigr. gr.* 2.553.

³⁶ New inscriptions and important discussion by A. Laumonier, *BCH*, 58, 1934, 337 ff. [C. F. E.]

³⁷ Add *Suppl. epigr. gr.* 7.146-7; H. Seyrig, *Syria*, 14, 1933, 263 ff.

³⁸ For the god's foot as performing miracles, cf. O. Weinreich, *Antike Heilungswunder*, 67 ff.

³⁹ Kalinka, *Tituli Asiae minoris*, II 2, no. 402.

⁴⁰ Votive inscription at Sebastopolis to appear in *Studie Pontica* 3, 284; M. Cumont has kindly supplied a copy of the text.

Ζεὺς ὑψίστος	θεὸς ὑψίστος
	Bosporus (cult societies; 41 A.D. to 3rd cent.) ⁴¹ Egypt (nb. a prayer) ⁴² Africa (a defixio)

This conspectus suggests certain inferences. Theos Hypsistos is used at Miletus in the description of a priest and of a prophetes, and though these are honorary inscriptions and not official records, and a column exists with the inscription Διὸς ὑψίστου, the god thus worshipped may have been formally called Theos Hypsistos. Theos Hypsistos occurs also at Serdica in the collective act of piety of a sodality, and presumably was the official title there, as also in the societies in Bosporus and in the spot in the region of Sinope from which we have another record. But in the main the title belongs to the language of private dedications.⁴³ On the other hand Zeus Hypsistos has a temple at Thebes, a statue at Corinth, possibly a priestess at Argos, a precinct at Iasos, a priest (shared with Agathe Tyche) at Mylasa, not to mention a cult association at Edessa. The cult under this name has therefore in these places full standing. Accordingly, while a Theos Hypsistos might conceivably here and there be given the more colorful title Zeus Hypsistos — for in Hellenistic times Zeus was at times almost a descriptive term meaning ‘chief god’ rather than the personal name of a traditional Greek divine character⁴⁴ — it would appear that in the main the process went the other way and that where Zeus Hypsistos and Theos Hypsistos exist side by side the Zeus form is the earlier and Theos Hypsistos may be an unofficial synonym for him (as elsewhere for other gods).

⁴¹ Revised readings of one text in Suppl. epigr. gr. 3.590.

⁴² On this, cf. Cumont, *Atti pontif. Acc. rom. arch. Ser. 3, Memorie*, 1. 1, 1923, 76 no. 22: p. 64 later.

⁴³ ὑψίστος, like ὁστος καὶ δίκαιος and unlike σώζων, appears never to be found as a legend on coins.

⁴⁴ Cf. at Jerash Διὶ Ἑλίῳ [καὶ] Διὶ Σαράπιδι (A. H. M. Jones, *JRS*, 18, 1928, 172).

We must therefore attach some importance to Zeus Hypsistos as a native Greek concept, similar to Zeus Hypatos who was worshipped in half a dozen places (Cook 875 f.). In poetry Zeus is ὑψίστος,⁴⁵ ὑπέρτατος, and παννύπερτατος. These adjectives denote Zeus as the chief of gods and men. As such he can be associated with mountains: if we examine the places listed as having a cult of Zeus Hypsistos or Theos Hypsistos, we find other and explicit mountain cults of Zeus at Athens, Thebes, Olympia, Corcyra, in Macedonia, at Tralles, in Lydia, Phrygia, and Pontus.⁴⁶ The epithet has this connotation in Sophocles, Trachiniae 1191 f.

HP. οἶσθ' οὖν τὸν Οἴτης Ζηνὸς ὑψίστου πάγον;

ΤΑ. οἶδ' ὡς θυτήρ γε πολλὰ δὴ σταθεὶς ἄνω, —

even if we do not, with Pearson, accept Wakefield's emendation ὑψίστου for ὑψιστον. But it seems as a rule to bear a more general sense of supremacy, or to refer to Zeus as sky-god (as in Soph. Philoct. 1289); Pausanias 2.2.8 tells of three images of Zeus at Corinth: one without epithet, one of him as Chthonios, one of him as Hypsistos. As Nilsson remarks (The Mycenaean origin of Greek mythology, 231), 'Zeus dwells on the mountain peak or in the heavens — these are the same — because he is the weather-god.'⁴⁷

Most of the votive inscriptions for Zeus Hypsistos and Theos Hypsistos are not dated, but perhaps the earliest known are two (identical) of Zoilus, the son of Alexander, to Zeus Hypsistos at Edessa, which may on grounds of lettering be referred to the first half of the second century B.C.⁴⁸ The place is suggestive, and we have from it six dedications in all. Edessa was

⁴⁵ Note in particular Ζηνὸς ὑψίστου in the hymn to Apollo by Aristonous of Corinth (latter half of 3rd cent. B.C.) inscribed on stone at Delphi and the cause of honors to its author: Diehl, Anthologia lyrica, 2, 298. In the hymn to Isis at Cyrene (103 A.D.) we read, καλοῦσι δὴ με πάντες ὑψίστην θεόν (W. Peek, Der Isishymnus von Andros, 129).

⁴⁶ Cf. Cook, 868 ff.

⁴⁷ Cf. Pindar, Pae. 6.92 f., νέφεσσι δὲ χρυσεῶις Ὀλύμπιοι καὶ κορυφαῖσιν ἔζων . . Ζεὺς ὁ θεῶν σκοπός.

⁴⁸ S. Pelekides, Arch. Delt. 8. 1923 (pub. 1925) 268. Mr. C. F. Edson, Jr., to whom this point is due, remarks that it is at least a coincidence that we know a Zoilus as mintmaster under king Perseus till ca. 174/3 B.C. (A. Mammoth, Z. f. Num. 38, 1928, 4 ff.). Mr. Tod, while emphasizing the fact that we are not yet

the old Macedonian capital, set at the foot of Mt. Bora, and in Macedon Zeus was of supreme importance as national and royal god, perhaps also as mountain-god; their society was Homeric, and Zeus may have had the standing which he has in Homer.⁴⁹ The eagle which appears on one of the stelae is the traditional attribute of Zeus, and emerged at just this time on Antigonid coinage.⁵⁰ Although Oriental cults had reached Macedonia by the end of the third century B.C.,⁵¹ it seems likely that this is a native cult.

A dedication was addressed to the gods and not to the public, and therefore there was not in antiquity that need, which a modern man might feel, for the avoidance of ambiguity; circumlocutions were used which were intelligible only to the dedicant; e.g., *θεῶ ἐπηκόω*, *θεῶν ἐπηκόων*,⁵² or the god was not named at all. At the same time, the probability is that, for a Macedonian, Zeus was too national a figure, too strongly marked a personality for a foreign god to be given his name without some unmistakably distinctive epithet. The stele of

able to trace the development of Macedonian lettering chronologically, thinks this text compatible with a date fairly early in the 2nd cent. B.C.; it looks older, he says, than Ann. Brit. Sch. Ath., 18.145 (128 B.C.) and is fairly certainly later than 18.134 (ca. 240 B.C.) Mr. Edson also draws attention to the speculations of Eephanthus on the kinship of god, king, and eagle (E. R. Goodenough, *Yale Classical Studies*, 1, 1928, 82 f.); cf. Corp. Herm. 18.16 and Cic. de diuinat. 1.26 and Pease ad loc., and in particular his reference to Arrian Anab. 2.3.3f., in which Gordios is said to have seen an eagle sitting on the yoke of his oxen, and to have been told to sacrifice to Zeus the king, and to the cult of Zeus of Bottiaea, on which cf. E. Babelon, *Rois de Syrie*, xi. The two griffins in the akroterion of the stele are separated from the eagle, which stands in a wreath (as on the coins struck by the mintmaster Zoilus for Perseus) under the inscription; there can be no thought of the later use of both eagle and griffin as symbols of apotheosis. In spite of the generally Oriental connections of the griffin (Cumont, *Syria*, 9, 1928, 102), there need be no direct relation to the East, for the griffin was familiar in these parts, as we see from the early coins of Abdera.

⁴⁹ M. P. Nilsson, *The Mycenaean origin of Greek mythology*, 221 ff., argues forcibly that Zeus is originally the one god dwelling on the mountain peak or in the heavens.

⁵⁰ It is a Ptolemaic emblem from the beginning of their coinage. On the stele, as on Ptolemaic coins, the eagle faces left; on the coins of Perseus, as on the silver and bronze struck by Alexander at Amphipolis, he faces right.

⁵¹ Cf. Edson ap. Nock, *Conversion*, 282.

⁵² Cf. O. Weinreich, *Ath. Mitt.* 37, 1912, 19 ff.; Campbell Thompson — R. W. Hutchinson, *Archaeologia*, 79, 1929, 140 ff. (in temple of Nebo at Nineveh;

Zoilus is, after all, a carefully cut monument, and not a casual graffito or cheap dedication by a poor man.

The Greek background for the epithet Hypsistos has been emphasised elsewhere; this specially Macedonian background⁵³ deserves attention in view of its possible importance for the regions into which Macedonians went as rulers. Caria had its period of Macedonian rule;⁵⁴ Stratonicea, Thyatira, and Philadelphia in Lydia were Macedonian colonies, and Samaria received a Macedonian settlement. After all, the chief Macedonian deities, Zeus, Heracles and Dionysus, and the neighboring Cabiri did gain in influence in the age of the Successors. In view of the relatively small number of Macedonian inscriptions thus far published, it is remarkable to find six to Zeus Hypsistos at Edessa.

Hypsistos is not precise, as was an epithet when it described the local home of a god or his specific function. In Syria Zeus Hypsistos and Theos Hypsistos were both used to describe the local Baal of a given region,⁵⁵ many of them mountain gods.⁵⁶ The Zeus Hypsistos worshipped on Mount Cynthus on Delos was probably of this kind (p. 58 above). In Lydia we have not only Theos Hypsistos used freely, but also Thea Hypsiste, clearly for some form of the mothergoddess,⁵⁷ in Phrygia Theos

mid. 1st cent. A.D.); Suppl. epigr. gr. 3.535 (of Thracian ridergod); A. Rehm Milet, 1.7. p. 349 no. 285 Χαριδῆμος Χαριδήμων Ἀπολλᾶς Βασιλεῖ ἐπηκόω εὐχῆν, where, as the editor remarks, the god might be Zeus, Apollo, Asklepios, or even Sarapis.

⁵³ O. Hoffmann, RE, 14, 690 explains the Macedonian month name ὑπερβερεταῖος as derived from a (postulated) festival of Zeus ὑπερβερέτας, an epithet which would be synonymous with ὑπέτος, ὑπέρτατος, ὑπερμενής.

While this article is in proof Mr. C. F. Edson writes that Dr. Ch. I. Makatonas has found more Zeus Hypsistos inscriptions at Kozani in Macedonia.

⁵⁴ A. Laumonier, BCH, 58, 1934, 294 ff. [C. F. E.] Note at Lagina Διὶ ὑψίστῳ καὶ θεῷ τῷ βασιλικῷ. (Cook, 879).

⁵⁵ Cf. Adad as 'summum maximumque' in Macrobian Sat. 1, 23. 17; R. Dussaud, Rev. Arch. 4th Ser. 5, 1905, 161 ff.; W. W. Baudissin, Adonis u. Esmun 77 n.; Baudissin-Eissfeldt, Kyrios, 3. 83; Cumont, Arch. f. Rel. 9, 1906, 334; RE, 9. 444 ff.; C. H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, 11.

⁵⁶ Cf. Suppl. epigr. gr. 7.59 (4th ? cent. A.D., between Beroea and Antioch) κατὰ κέλυσιν Διὶ κορυφῷ.

⁵⁷ Keil-von Premerstein, Zweite Reisebericht (Denkschr. Wien, 54, 2, 1911), no. 189; cf. their note on no. 39 in their first Bericht. (Denkschr. Wien, 53, 2, 1908). It would hardly be plausible to suggest that Hypsiste represents the sur-

Hypsistos seems once to denote the local Zeus Benneus;⁵⁸ in Caria Zeus Hypsistos is associated with a mysterious secondary deity;^{58a} in Cyprus and at Athens Theos Hypsistos is a god of healing,⁵⁹ perhaps some form of Esmun.

One specialized use has attracted considerable attention. Schürer showed that (Theos) Hypsistos was a common term in the later canonical books of the Old Testament and in the writings of hellenistic Judaism to denote the god of the Jews, and that the cult directed to Theos Hypsistos in the Bosphorus was an offshoot of Judaism, in which hellenizing Jews and Judaizing Gentiles found a religious meeting-ground; he was able to point to similar coalescence in the sect of Hypsistarioi in Cappadocia in the fourth century of our era and to other analogies.⁶⁰ Cumont followed this by the demonstration that there was a certain confusion between Sabaoth, wrongly taken to be a proper name, and Sabazios, and so explained the ascription to Jews of an interest in Sabazios, the dedication by the thiasos Sebazianos at Serdica to Theos Hypsistos, and the Dionysiac scene represented on the Cyzicene relief dedicated to Zeus Hypsistos.⁶¹ These facts are of great importance; they

vival of a type of Judaism such as we know at Elephantine in the text published by A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (note pp. xviii f.).

⁵⁸ Cook, 883.

^{58a} A. Laumonier, *BCH*, 58, 1934, 337 ff.

⁵⁹ Perdrizet, *BCH*, 20, 1896, 363; add A. Dain, *Inscriptions grecques du Musée du Louvre*, no. 71. In one of the Delian texts, which is almost certainly Jewish, *θεὸς ὑψίστος* is thanked for a healing (Plassart, *Mélanges Holleaux*, 205, 209 f.).

⁶⁰ *Berlin Sitzungsberichte*, 1897, 200 ff. For such development, cf. Epiphan. *Pan.* 80.1.

⁶¹ Hypsistos (*Supp. Rev. Instr. Publ. Belg.*, 1897); *C. R. Ac. Inscr.* 1906, 63 ff.; *Musée Belge*, 14, 1910, 55 ff. Cf. W. M. Calder, *JHS*, 31, 1911, 196 on *Ἱερὸν Ὀρονδία* near Laodicea Combusta, *Ἱερὸν Διονύσιον* north of Iconium as including transliterations of Jahwe; Keil-Premmerstein, 2, no. 224 and their note for the cult of the cosmic *θεὸς Σαβαθικός*. — *ἱερεὺς θεοῦ ὑψίστου* at Iconium (H. S. Cronin, *JHS*, 22, 1902, 124) is probably Christian, as Professor Calder kindly states in a letter, on grounds of style and period, although it is not (as has been stated) accompanied by crosses; but, as he adds, *ὑψίστος* is apparently unique in Christian epigraphy and the text may (as W. M. Ramsay suggests, *Luke the Physician*, 389 ff.) come from the Hypsistarioi. There is the alternative possibility of its being a literary *flosculus*, chosen as metrically convenient; the text includes also *ὁπάων*. [Calder's transcript, made in 1908, gives *ὑψίστοιον*, not *ὑψίστου*. He further notes that the subject of the

remind us that the opposition of Jew and Gentile at Alexandria and in some of the Syrian and Ionian cities was not universal⁶² and that the barrier between them was not so great in the smaller towns of Asia Minor — a fact of considerable importance for the spread of Christianity through the synagogue to the fringe of interested outsiders. Nevertheless, we may question the inference, sometimes made, that Jewish influence is to be seen in the majority of instances of Theos Hypsistos and Zeus Hypsistos.

We have to allow that the term is used with greater frequency in Jewish writings than in others, and that it does not figure in the list given by Aristides or in other ancient lists of the epithets of Zeus. In spite of instances in earlier poetry, it had ceased to be in literary use, and the material here discussed belongs for the most part to sections of society in which the intelligentsia had little interest. We may further grant that a term might spread from Jews and Judaizers and then go to wider circles on its own merits, as at Apamea in Phrygia the type of Noah's ark found its way onto civic coinage and appears on issues made by mint-masters who were responsible also for purely pagan types.^{62a} But the use of Hypsistos had a non-Jewish background also; and while in Lydia Theos Hypsistos is not coupled in dedications with the names of other deities,⁶³ at Alexandria Helios and the Nemeseis are invoked

inscription must be identical with the *πρεσβύτερος* of J. R. S. Sterrett, Epigraphical journey. no. 197.]

⁶² When the Jews revolted in 66 A.D. there were disturbances in some but not all Syrian cities and in Alexandria, but they are not recorded elsewhere (Josephus, BJ, 2, 457 ff.: R. O. Fink, Journ. Rom. Stud. 23, 1933, 119; in 116 the troubles were in Alexandria, Cyrenaica, Mesopotamia, and Cyprus (B. W. Henderson, Five Roman Emperors, 334 ff.). Even at Alexandria earlier Philo states that large numbers of non-Jews came over to the celebration of the making of the Septuagint held on the island of Pharos every year (De vita Mosis 2. 7 sect. 41, ii p. 140/1 Mangey).

^{62a} A. J. Reinach, Rev. ét. juives, 65 and 66, 1913 (with the suggestion that Jewish and Phrygian legends had combined).

⁶³ J. Keil, Anatolian Studies presented to Sir William Ramsay, 263; in RE, 13, 2197 he is less confident about the explanation from Judaism. Zeus Hypsistos at Cyzicus, who has the quasi-Dionysiac relief, is coupled with other ordinary pagan deities: cf. n. 25 above. V. Pârvan, Dacia, 1, 1924, 277 entered a general caveat.

after and with Theos Hypsistos,⁶⁴ and the absence of other deities can be explained from the trend to henotheism which the epithet involved and which was widespread even where there was no Jewish influence. We have seen other instances of alien affiliations of the epithet Hypsistos.

Contrast the Bosporean inscriptions, in which Hypsistos is coupled with pantokrator, which is far less common in contexts which are on the face of it neutral, and eulogetos, which has no chance of being Greek; a vernacular equivalent of the latter occurs in Palmyrene bilinguals coupled with the $\Delta\iota\ \upsilon\psi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\omega\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\pi\eta\kappa\acute{o}\omega\ \kappa\tau\lambda.$ ⁶⁵ This god receives about 120 dedications at Palmyra, more than any other god. The worship paid to him was clearly non-Jewish, and yet the ideas associated with him could approximate to those of Judaism. Thus there is a fire altar — a thing in itself incompatible with Jewish practice — bearing the inscription 'Malchos, the son of Bareas, the son of Malichos, offers thanks to the one and only merciful god': $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \text{Μάλλχος Βαρέα τοῦ Μαλίχου ἐνὶ μόνῳ ἐλεήμονι θεῷ}.$ In fact, we are on a religious frontier.⁶⁶ The religious conditions seen here have some value as an analogy for the soil from which Islam sprang.

Contrast again Delos, where there is the crucial word $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$; contrast Thessalonica, where $\theta\epsilon\acute{\omega}\ \upsilon\psi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\omega\ \kappa\alpha\tau'\ \epsilon\pi\iota\tau\alpha\gamma\acute{\eta}\nu$ is followed by the letters IOTΕΣ, which may be an attempt to transliterate the name of Jahwe;⁶⁷ contrast the tomb-inscription near Acmonia which has the phrase $\epsilon\sigma\text{]}\tau\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\ \pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma\ \tau\acute{o}\nu\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\nu\ \tau\acute{o}\nu\ \upsilon\psi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$, which must be Jewish or Christian.⁶⁸ In such instances we see clearly the impact of Jewish or Judaizing culture; perhaps we should in others, but it is not possible to be dogmatic; the ground quakes under our tread.⁶⁹ It is, however,

⁶⁴ Cook 889.

⁶⁵ Cook 885 f.

⁶⁶ H. Seyrig, *Syria*, 14, 1933, 270 ff. This god can be coupled with the Dioscuri, ib. 280 ff.: with 'la Bonne Epoque,' 252 n. 6. For him cf. also Cumont, *Fouilles de Doura-Europos*, 104 n. 4.

⁶⁷ A. Plassart, *Rev. biblique*, N. S. 11, 1914, 529, n. 5.

⁶⁸ W. M. Ramsay, *Cities and bishoprics of Phrygia*, 2, 652 f., no. 563.

⁶⁹ The material at Seleucia on the Calycadnus (n. 24 supra) has been treated as Jewish, in view of the known later strength of the Jewish colony there: and

obvious that by terminology of the ὑψιστος type men meant something which was to them very definite.⁷⁰ two dedications are of pre-eminent value, one θεῶ ὑψιστῶ at Mytilene made by a member of the local senate of Sarmizegetusa (IGR, 4, 47), one at Nacolea in Phrygia, recording the payment θεῶ ὑψιστῶ from a vow made in Rome (ib., 542).

Hypsistos was a term in use, vague enough to suit any god treated as the supreme being; as Cook says (890) 'a title that any honest man could use with a clear conscience.'⁷¹ It fitted Jahwe perfectly, and Jewish and Christian writers put it in the mouths of non-Israelites who recognized their God;⁷² but would it suggest him to anyone except a Jew or a Judaizer? Celsus twice gives Hypsistos as a Jewish name for god — (1.23/4) 'whether Hypsistos or Adonai or Ouranios or Sabaoth or however they like to call this universe, not that there is any difference in using the Greek name Zen or the Indian name or the Egyptian name,' and (5.41) 'So I do not think that it makes any difference to call Zeus Hypsistos or Zen or Adonai or Sabaoth or, as the Egyptians do, Amoun, or, as the Scythians, Papaïos.' But Celsus had to familiarize himself with biblical writings, and in the second passage he is being very precise, as is shown by the use of Amoun instead of the common Greek form Ammon. Origen, in his reply, speaks on the first occasion

yet, could a Jew or Judaizer have so used the name Zeus? Possibly; we simply do not know the limits of Jewish divagation.

⁷⁰ Lebas-Waddington ad no. 416 emphasize the distinction of Zeus Hypsistos at Mylasa from the three other forms of Zeus there known.

⁷¹ Note ib. 834 a dedication from the district of Cyzicus (2nd or 3rd cent. A.D.), Τιβέριος Κλαύδιος Σύντροφος Διὶ ὑψιστῶ κατ' ἐπιταγὴν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἀνέθηκεν βρονταίῳ, where βρονταίῳ may be, as Cook suggests, an afterthought, or may again be due to the writer having felt that some more specific and personal epithet was needed.

⁷² Cf. J. A. Montgomery, Daniel, 215 f.; Lake-Cadbury on Acts 7.48 and 16.17; cf. G. F. Moore, Judaism, 3, 132 (he emphasizes that ὑψιστος had not a fixed relation to a fixed Hebrew word). There is a curious analogy in the Aramaic papyri from Elephantine. In them Jews commonly (not always) use to one another the phrase 'ya' u the God, but in dealing with Persians repeatedly (not always) the God of heaven or 'ya' u the God of heaven (A. Cowley, Aramaic papyri, xviii) and in no. 32.3 (according to Cowley, apparently a note by the messenger of an answer given verbally) the Persian authorities are recorded as saying 'the God of heaven' (ib. 123); but in no. 30.6 the priests of Khnub are represented as using 'ya' u the God (ib. 113).

about Sabaoth, Adonai and 'other names handed down among the Hebrews with great solemnity,' on the second about the god of Abraham, the god of Isaac, the god of Jacob, Adonai, Sabaoth, Amoun Papaïos, and says nothing explicit about Hypsistos. Julian, again, knows the term, saying in a letter written on the eve of his Persian expedition and referring to his proposed restoration of the temple at Jerusalem ἀνεγείρω γὰρ μετὰ πάσης προθυμίας τὸν ναὸν τοῦ ὑψίστου θεοῦ, but Julian, like Celsus, was familiar with Jewish and Christian usage.⁷³ In the magic papyri, though they show many traces of Jewish influence, Hypsistos is used twice of Semitic deities other than Jahwe, once of Jahwe.⁷⁴

We may infer that Jewish influence, though sometimes a contributory factor, was not all-important.⁷⁵ What is at stake is not an origin; there were clearly several. It is the dissemination and popularity of the epithet. Is not the explanation to be sought in the tendency to concentrate powers in the hands of one deity, thought of as reigning over all from an exalted

⁷³ Epistulae et leges, ed. Bidez-Cumont, 134 p. 193; in a contemporary letter probably to Theodorus he says εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ κληθέντος ἐπ' αὐτῷ θεοῦ (89b, p. 135). Nectarius, the pagan son of a Christian, writing to Augustine (Ep. 103) has 'cum nos ad exsuperantissimi Dei cultum compelleres' and 'Deus summus te custodiat'; P. Batiffol, La paix constantinienne et le catholicisme, 192, notes that Christian terminology accepted 'summus' but not 'exsuperantissimus.'

⁷⁴ Preisendanz, P. gr. mag. 4, 1068 (of Balsames), 5.46 (of solar god), 12.63 (of Iao Adonai); ὑψίστος is applied to God the Father and to Christ in P. Oslo., 5.7, 10 (Preisendanz, vol. II, p. 191). Philo Ad Gaium 23 § 157 (2, p. 569 M), 40 § 317 (p. 592) are quoted as instances of Roman officials using ὑψίστος θεός to mean Jahwe; but in both Philo is not professing to quote verbally and is presumably using his own words.

⁷⁵ The dedication and solemn kindling of lamps has been thought to point to Jewish influence but is not a clear indication, in view of the frequency with which lamps were dedicated to gods in general (Nilsson, Gött. gel. Anz., 1916, 49 ff.). A puzzling case is OGI 755/6, two inscriptions, the first mentioning a priest τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου θεοῦ ὑψίστου σωτήρος, the second a prophetes τ. ἀ. θ. ὁ., at Miletus, as honored by the gardeners and the associated spikers of razorfish respectively. We have no information as to the date of these texts. They may show Jewish influence — to judge from the cumulative effect of the epithets: or they may be related to the monotheistic trend of the oracle of Claros, which is credited with an interest in Jewish piety; cf. Nock, Rev. ét. anc. 30.1928, 280 ff.

The possibilities of coincidence are illustrated by the appearance of κυρίῳ θιῶ at Philippopolis with a relief of the Thracian rider-god (Suppl. epigr. gr., 3. 513). Cf. V. Pârvan, Riv. di fil., 52, 1924, 326 on a henotheistic trend in Thrace.

station in the skies? If so, the epithet is on a par with 'exsuperantissimus,'⁷⁶ with the difference that it acquired a much wider usage and an existence independent of the other divine titles with which that was usually combined.⁷⁷ There is another factor, applying specially to Asia Minor, and that is the popularity of somewhat vague divine titles such as *theos hosios* *kai dikaios*, *theos sozon*. They denote a solar god, commonly a ridergod, but there is an extraordinary fluidity of language; we find 'Ὀσίῳ Δικέῳ, θεῷ ὀσίῳ καὶ δικαίῳ, θεῷ ὀσίῳ δικαίῳ, 'Οσειῳ, 'Οσίῳ θεῷ, Θεοῖς 'Οσίῳ καὶ Δικαίῳ, θεοῖς ὀσίοις καὶ δικαίοις and the adjectival use of these words, as θεῷ δικαίῳ Μίθρα, Λητοίδῃ σώζοντι καὶ 'Ηελίῳ βασιλῆι . . . δικαιοτάτοις ἢδ' ὀσίοισι θ[εοῖς].⁷⁸ The

⁷⁶ Often coupled with 'summus': Cumont, *Arch. Rel.* 9, 1906, 323 ff.; Türk, *RE*, 4A, 900 f. 'summus' had a wide use in Latin from early times: it is in no sense specific, though it could be adapted to the henotheistic trend (Batiffol, *La paix constantinienne*, 188 ff.).

⁷⁷ At Pergamon we have 'Ἡλίῳ θεῷ ὑψίστῳ on a small altar (Cook 882); at Badinlar in Phrygia [Ἀπόλ]λωνι Δ[αίρβ]ην[φ] θεῷ ὑψίστῳ (Ramsay, *JHS*, 10, 1889, 223); Alexander Polyhistor ap. Diog. Laert. 8.31 has ἀγεσθαι μὲν τὰς καθαρὰς (sc. ψυχὰς) ἐπὶ τὸν ὑψίστον, referring to the supreme being as enthroned in the highest celestial sphere (A. Delatte, *La vie de Pythagore* [Mém. acad. Belg. 2nd Ser. 17.2.1922], 226 f.). In a dedication at Rome of 370 A.D. we have Ἄττει θ' ὑψίστῳ καὶ συνέχοντι τὸ πᾶν (CIL, 6.509). Attis, like Cybele, had from near the end of the third century A.D., been called omnipotent; σ.τ.π. is said by Graillet, *Culte de Cybèle*, 549 n. 6 to be 'empruntée à la langue des mystères,' but the verb συνέχω is a term expressly said by Galen to belong to later Stoicism (cf. J. von Arnim, *Sto. uet. fragm.*, 2 pp. 144 ff.; hence the use in Corp. Herm. VIII 2, XI 5, Exc. Herm. XIV 1, XV 1 ed. Scott). A smaller figure could under the stress of emotion be promoted to such rank. Thus a dedication from the territory of Rithymna in Crete (Kaibel, *Epigr. gr.* 815; prob. 2nd cent. A.D.) tells how Salvius Menas and his wife worshipped Hermes; she died, and apparently he regarded it as due to his omission of an annual sacrifice. He grieved and learnt his lesson, and in the closing couplet invoked the god as παντοκράτωρ Ἐριούνιος (the whole is reminiscent of confession-inscriptions and of the aretalogy type in general; cf. Nock, *Conversion*, 83 ff.). Hermes is κύριος and σωτήρ in a dedication at Comana in Cappadocia (A. Souter, *Studies* Ramsay, 402 f.). So Priapus became a solar deity (H. Herter, *De Priapo*, 306) and 'pantheus' (ib. 236 ff.). ὕπατος was earlier occasionally used of other gods (Jessen, *RE*, 9.250 f.), and the sun is ὕπατος [θεῶν] in the Susa hymn, *Suppl. epigr. gr.* 7.14; cf. [Eurip.] *Rhes.* 703 πόλον δ' εὐχεται τὸν ὕπατον θεῶν;

⁷⁸ Cf. G. Mendel, *Cat. sculpt. Constantinople*, 3, 52 ff.; A. Körte, *Ath. Mitt.* 25, 1900. 431 ff., 443 f. (with revised reading, *Suppl. epigr. gr.* 1, 463); Cumont, *Textes et Monuments*, 2, 172 no. 548; J. Zingerle, *Jahresh.*, 22, 1926, Beibl. 50 f. (with remarks on the tendency to a neutral view of deity); Keil-von Premerstein, 2, 180, 186; Buckler-Calder-Cox, *JRS*, 15, 1925, 161 f.; *Suppl. epigr. gr.* 6. 409, with Zingerle's note, for Δικαίῳ separately.

sharp anthropomorphism of literature and art was something superimposed, which never wholly mastered the popular mind and which wore thin under the Empire; in those parts of the Graeco-Roman world which lay outside the main stream of intellectual life it had never established itself.⁷⁹

It follows that we have little light from outside on the meaning of Hypsistos in our text. Theos Hypsistos is known in Egypt from the dedication of a Jewish proseucha in the second century B.C.,⁸⁰ from another dedication of 29 B.C. in the Fayum which may be Jewish,⁸¹ and from the magic papyri.⁸² Zeus Hypsistos is apparently new. The practice of libation, and the description of the king as 'god and lord' go beyond anything that we can credit to a cult derived from Judaism, however denatured. Further, the phrase implies that the temple in which the meetings were to take place was a civic temple, large enough to contain a room suitable for the purpose, and not a private shrine. A Semitic cult is at least improbable.

We have mentioned the possibility that the papyrus comes from Philadelphia. Excavation has there disclosed one large temple precinct, the ground plan of which shows traces which may well point to priestly dwellings, storerooms, or the like.⁸³ Other papyri indicate the presence of a Hermaion (whether dedicated to Hermes or to Thoth), a sanctuary, with enclosing wall of Poremanres (the deified Amenemhet III),⁸⁴ and quarters named after a Boubasteion and a Harbich(ieion?), implying their presence and perhaps their consequence.⁸⁵ A letter of Apollonius, the finance minister to Zeno, proves that the Sarapieion, a temple of the Dioscuri, and another, perhaps one for the royal house, were together along the canal;⁸⁶ and other

⁷⁹ Cf. Nock, *Harv. Theol. Rev.* 23, 1930, 261 f.; *Am. J. Phil.* 55, 1934, 288 f.; and on the thin line between abstraction and personification cf. L. Radermacher, *Jahresh.*, 29, 1934, 93 ff.

⁸⁰ OGI, 96; in 742 (37 B.C.) simply θεῶ μεγάλῳ ἐπηκόῳ.

⁸¹ O. Rubensohn, *Arch. Pap.*, 5, 1909, 163 n. 10, θεῶ μεγάλῳ μεγάλῳ ὑψίστῳ. The names of the dedicants do not prove anything.

⁸² n. 74 above. The prayer at Alexandria has been mentioned n. 42 and pp. 64 f.

⁸³ P. Viereck, *Philadelphia*, 12 ff.; Viereck-Zucker, *BGU* 7 pp. 7 ff.

⁸⁴ C. C. Edgar, *Zenon papyri in the University of Michigan*, 84.

⁸⁵ *BGU*, 1579. 9 f. (118/9 A.D.), 1580.11 (119 A.D.).

⁸⁶ Edgar, p. 162; *P. Cairo Zen.* 59168. For Dioscuri, cf. *P. Cairo Zen.* 59569.24.

records tell us of shrines of Thooris, Anubis, Ammon, Isis, Demeter, Kore, Nemesis, Arsinoe, the Theoi Adelphoi, the Samothracian deities, possibly Horus of Meten,⁸⁷ Suchos,⁸⁸ Zeus, the Carian Zeus Labrayndaïos (though the reference may be interpreted of a temple elsewhere), Asklepios,⁸⁹ of a Metroon, which was of some proportions, and of a private shrine to the Syrian goddess.⁹⁰

Philadelphia was a new creation, with no old Egyptian temples. Cults had to be created as part of the planning of the settlement of the Fayum. We must hope that new discoveries will throw light on the way in which this was done. We know of liberalities of the Finance Minister Apollonius to particular shrines.⁹¹ Many of these places of worship must have been very small. Thus P. Cairo Zen. 59308 records the payment of an annual allowance of 12 drachmae by the priest of Thooris at some other place, perhaps Oxyrhynchus, to the priest of Thooris at Philadelphia and states that this covered the expenses of sacrifice. So a text from Elephantine of 223/2 B.C. records contributions from other temples, probably for the building of a temple of Horus at Edfu.⁹² Temples were built also by individuals and by groups of individuals; the government took an interest in these things, and its permission was necessary even for the restoration of shrines in private possession.⁹³

⁸⁷ Viereck, Philadelphia, 14, U. Wilcken, Arch. Pap. 8, 1927, 280; H. I. Bell, Gnomon, 4, 1928, 585; P. Cairo Zen. 59745.32 and note on ll. 34-7. For the Arsinoeion cf. P. Columbia Zen. 39.14 f., with Westermann-Hasenoehtl ad loc. pp. 96 f.: for the Samothracian deities, P. Cairo Zen. 59296.32 (250 B.C.).

Anubis has been inferred from SB. 5796 (= Lefebvre, Ann. ant. serv., 13, 1913, 93 ff.), a votive relief which does not necessarily prove the existence of an independent temple.

⁸⁸ Wilcken, Arch. Pap. 9, 1928, 74.

⁸⁹ P. Cairo Zen. 59422.5 (the Zeus without epithet may be in fact Zeus Labrayndaïos, mentioned with Asklepios in the text cited in n. 91: it is not certain whether the temples in question were at Philadelphia); cf. P. Columbia Zen. 7 for a priest of Asklepios whose habitat is unspecified.

⁹⁰ U. Wilcken, Festgabe Deissmann, 1 ff. (SB, 7351).

⁹¹ Edgar 31, with notes, p. 96.

⁹² P. Rubensohn, P. Elephantine, 10 with notes pp. 43 ff.

⁹³ P. Enteuxeis, pp. 15 f.; on the Rosetta stone (OGI, 90.52) permission is formally given to private persons to celebrate the festival of the god Epiphanes Eucharistos and to erect and keep his shrine, performing the monthly and annual rites.

Nothing taxable or potentially taxable escaped them; that was the aspect of the case which concerned them. Otherwise they do not seem to have cared greatly about the shape which things took; certainly the paucity of Greek cults in the Fayum, settled as it originally was by veterans, is remarkable; for although inter-marriage with native women meant that the children would receive their early impressions from persons to whom the Greek tradition was foreign, as those children grew up they acquired Greek pride of race and might have been expected to give religious expression to their nationalism in a more pronounced manner.⁹⁴

Zeus Hypsistos at Philadelphia, if that is the home of this cult, may have been a god of whom we have there no other knowledge; the papyri have shown us a series of new worships. But he must have had a temple of fair proportions. Perhaps he was the Zeus Labrayndaïos, given in the course of time a general epithet instead of the local one. Again, he may have been Ammon. To be sure, Ammon is usually called directly by his own name, which was familiar from of old to the Greeks and did not need to be replaced by an equivalent, though two early votives speak of him as Zeus Thebaïos,⁹⁵

⁹⁴ For an instance of the first generation doing so, cf. p. 72 n. 100 later. Attention should be paid to a list of festivals preserved in P. Ross. Georg. 41 (2nd cent. A.D.; edited by O. Krüger, in Zereteli-Krüger, Papyri aus russischer u. georgischer Sammlungen, 2.188 ff.). It is 'Ροδοφόρια, Δήλια, Παντέλια Αἰγυπτίων, Σαράπια, Μηροβόλλια Αἰγυπτίων, 'Αμε[σ]ύ[σ](ι)α Αἰγυπτίων, Δημήτρια, Κηπούρια καὶ 'Ισια, Στεφανηφόρια, Σούχια. The Delia and Demetria are purely Greek and certain festivals are distinguished by the express description Αἰγυπτίων. This looks as though it were the calendar of the aggregate of temples in a place where Greek and Egyptian elements had their place side by side. In general cf. T. A. Brady, The reception of the Egyptian cults by the Greeks (University of Missouri Studies, 10, i, 1935), 14 ff.

⁹⁵ C. Smith, F. Ll. Griffith, Cl. Rev. 5. 1891, 77 ff.; W. M. F. Petrie, Naucratis, I. 28 pl. 30.2. Ture Kalén, Berliner Leihgabe griechischen Papyri I (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift), 188 explains no. 18.13 ἀροῦρας δύο Διὸς ἱεροῦ λεγο(μένης) as land that had once belonged to Ammon (though there is nothing in the papyrus to warrant this); the phrase occurs in a report to the village-scribe of Lagis in the Fayum.

As early as the 2nd cent. B.C. 'Αμμων could be regarded by the Egyptians as a Greek God; cf. the double names of certain individuals where the Demotic name is a translation of the Greek in Spiegelberg, Ein Erbstreit a.d. ptol. Ägypten (Schr. d. Wiss. Ges. in Strassburg, Heft 13, 1912) p. 45, à propos of the double name 'Αμμωνία ἢ καὶ Σεμῖνις; he also quotes the name Ψεναμοῦνις ὁ καὶ 'Αμμώνιος from P. Oxy. 494, 6, where the 'Greek' version of the name comes second. [T. C. S.]

and Herodotus refers to him as Zeus Thebaieus or simply as Zeus.⁹⁶ The possibility that it is Ammon seems worthy of mention, because Ammon emerges on coins under Ptolemy II, and perhaps, as J. G. Milne suggests, the gifted Arsinoe was responsible for this and glorified Ammon in order to appeal to her native subjects.⁹⁷ If this is right, Ammon may have had a fairly large temple at Philadelphia, a foundation of her husband's reign. To an Egyptian Ammon was 'thou greatest one of heaven, thou oldest of earth, lord of all that is, who remainest in all things . . . of more exalted nature than any other god.'⁹⁸ Celsus, in a passage quoted earlier, equated Zeus, Hypsistos, Adonaios, Sabaoth, Amoun, and Papaaios.⁹⁹

Nevertheless in view of the dedications from Edessa, Zeus Hypsistos may have been of Macedonian origin; there is nothing against the hypothesis of a hitherto unknown temple.¹⁰⁰

V. GREEK AND EGYPTIAN FORMS OF ASSOCIATION

Synodos is a word of wide range. It covers a private dinner party, a funeral wake, an annual dinner established by a bequest, union in the genos, a banquet after sacrifice, the meeting of an association or group, and the association itself.¹⁰¹ In a financial decree of Euergetes II and in the Gnomon of the Idios Logos, or abstract of the regulations of a high Roman financial official in Egypt, it is the generic term for associations.¹⁰²

It is frequently coupled with the name of the god worshipped by the group; ¹⁰³ so in Egypt we have

⁹⁶ 2.42; 4.181; 2.74.

⁹⁷ Ancient Egypt, 1928, 37 ff; Griffith Studies, 13-15.

⁹⁸ 18th dyn. hymn trans. by H. Ranke in H. Gressmann, *Altorientalische Texte zum A. T.*, ed. 2, 13.

⁹⁹ Note the emergence of a curious Egyptian compound in Greek at the same time in 'Ερμεῖ 'Ηρακλεῖ (i.e. Thoth-Khonsu) 80/69 B.C.; in the Ghizeh Museum: J. G. Milne, JHS, 21, 1901, 281 ff. (unless it be asyndeton; cf. Mayser, 2. iii, 175 f.).

¹⁰⁰ At Xoïs the strategos of the nome and the Boeotians and their fellow dwellers there dedicated a precinct and what went with it to Zeus Basileus and their other ancestral gods (SB, 6664: 2nd cent. B.C.).

¹⁰¹ Poland, RE, 4A, 1420 ff.; add its use of a Jewish meeting in a proseucha in an unpublished Rylands papyrus, ἐπὶ τῆς []ης συναγωγῆς ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ . . . (after a few lines) εἰς τὴν σύνοδον.

¹⁰² P. Tebt. 700.38 (124 B.C.); P. M. Meyer, *Juristische Papyri*, p. 343 § 108.

¹⁰³ Cf. thiasos Εὐδίας 'Αφροδίτης τῶν σὺν Τετρία (Α)υδία Δωροθέα (A. Maiuri, *Nuova*

Greek texts

Synodos

of Heracles	at Philae	Under Philometor ¹⁰⁴
of Aphrodite. a . . . mares	Alexandria	2nd cent. B.C. ¹⁰⁵
of Pramarrēs	Socnopaiu Nesos	104 B.C. ¹⁰⁶
of the god Autokrator	Alexandria	6 B.C. ¹⁰⁷
Kaisar		
of Harpocrates	Tebtunis	45/6 A.D. ¹⁰⁸
of the god (Sobk?)	Tebtunis	45/6, 46/9 A.D. ¹⁰⁹
of Amenothēs	Neighborhood of Thebes	2nd cent. A.D. ¹¹⁰
of Tieoeos the god	Coptos	2nd cent. A.D. ¹¹¹

Demotic texts

of Harsamtus	Dendera	6 B.C. ¹¹²
of Hathor	Edfu	Roman ¹¹³
of Hathor	In nome of Dendera	Roman ¹¹⁴

silloge epigrafica di Rodi e Cos, 182 no. 495); Διὸς Σωτῆρος καὶ Ἀστάρτης (182 no. 496); in Bulgaria *συνποσιασταὶ θεοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ* (V. Dobrusky, Arch.-epigr.-Mitt. 18, 1893, 117 no. 30), τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Διοσκόρων (112 no. 19); at Tschygh Dag in Pamphylia *θίασος αὐτῆς*, sc. τῆς Μητρὸς θεᾶς ἐπηκόου Ὁρείας (Suppl. epigr. gr. 6.718).

¹⁰⁴ Rubensohn-L. Borchardt, Arch. Pap. 3, 1905, 356 ff. . . . [Ἀρεν]σνοῦ[φει] οἱ ἐν τῇ συνόδῳ τοῦ Ἡρακλείους ἀνοικοδομηκότες τὸ ἱερόν; the genitive might be thought ambiguous. The text is dated by U. Wilcken ib. 366 f. ca. 173/2 as just before Philometor's marriage; if that be accepted, the date becomes ca. 176/5 in view of W. Otto's arguments, Zur. Gesch. d. Z. des 6 Ptol. (Abh. München N. F. 11, 1934), 14: but Cleopatra II's position did not at once receive full recognition (ib. 135).

¹⁰⁵ Breccia, Iscrizioni, 144.

¹⁰⁶ Rubensohn, Z. äg. Spr., 42, 1905, 111 ff.

¹⁰⁷ Wilcken, Chr. 112.

¹⁰⁸ P. Mich. Tebt. 127, I, 30; P. Mich. Inv. 671 (written under Claudius or late in Tiberius' reign) refers to this or another synodos of Harpocrates at Tebtunis; probably to the same, but, since the number of members of such societies was not large and Harpocrates was a popular god, we cannot be certain.

¹⁰⁹ Ib. 127, I, 20; 124 recto II, 23.

¹¹⁰ J. G. Milne, Theban Ostraca, 158 f. no. 142.1; cf. P. Jouguet, Mélanges Glotz, 1, 498.

¹¹¹ P. Perdrizet, Terres cuites de la collection Fouquet, 1, 79 f.; a dedication to the god Ammonios, explained by P. as a syncretistic type of sphinx.

¹¹² W. Spiegelberg, Z. äg. Spr., 50, 1912, 36 ff.

¹¹³ Id., Dem. Denkm. 3.2, no. 50024.

¹¹⁴ Id., Dem. Inscr. 1.51, no. 31130; translation modified by Sottas, Rev. arch. 5th ser. 13.1921, 34. — On a synodos at Memphis in 17 B.C. a dedication by which is said to have been found in the temple of Ptah, cf. Inscr. gr. ad res Rom. 1, 1114; W. Otto, Priester, 1, 127; P. Roussel, Rev. ét. gr. 42, 1929, 144.

In place of the name in the genitive we find also a descriptive adjective derived from the name of the deity worshipped; so

Ἑσερχηβιακή (from a local Isis)	Place unknown	78 B.C. ¹¹⁵
Εἰσιακή	Philae (<i>ut aiunt</i>)	13 B.C. ¹¹⁶
Θερμουθιακή (from Thermouthis)	Alexandria	25 A.D. ¹¹⁷
Ἀπολλωνιακή	Alexandria	not earlier than 1st cent. A.D. ¹¹⁸
Σαμβαθική	Naucratis	Roman ¹¹⁹
ὁ ἐν Σ(υ)ήνῃ Διοσκουριακὸς θίασος	Syene	1st cent. B.C. ¹²⁰

We find also a genitive of the shrine, as τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ Ἑρμαίου συνόδου in the district of Ombos in 78 B.C.¹²¹ and again more familiar derivative titles as for instance συνβασιλισταὶ καὶ Διοσκουριασταὶ¹²² and the second century A.D. description of an association of athletes as σύνοδος τῶν περὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα.¹²³

Papyri and inscriptions have given us records of these religious associations, which served social and patriotic as well as religious purposes, of many occupational and military associations, which again commonly had a footing in religion, of synodoi the precise nature of which is not stated, and of local synodoi with titles such as σύνοδος τῆς κώμης which, in the absence of civic organization, provided local festivities.¹²⁴

The constitutions of these societies, so far as they are known to us, have many common features which they share with similar societies in other parts of the Greek world. Our text has three distinctive elements:

¹¹⁵ Strack, Arch. Pap., 3, 1903, 131.

¹¹⁶ Inscr. gr. ad res Rom. 1, 1303.

¹¹⁷ Ib. 1084.

¹¹⁸ Breccia 132.

¹¹⁹ Inscr. gr. ad res Rom. 1, 1106.

¹²⁰ P. Jouguet-O. Guéraud, Egyptus, 13, 1933, 446 no. 5.

¹²¹ Preisigke-Spiegelberg, Prinz Joachim Ostraka, 2.12; Preisigke supplies <τῆς> before τοῦ.

¹²² Poland RE, 4A, 1330.

¹²³ P. Lond. 1178.32; cf. Keil-von Premerstein, Zweite Reisebericht. p. 39.

¹²⁴ In general cf. F. Poland, Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens, and RE, 4A, 1420 ff.; M. san Nicolò, Ägyptisches Vereinswesen zur Zeit der Ptolemäer u. Römer (the completion of which is greatly to be desired), and article in EHI-TTMBION Swoboda, 255 ff.; W. L. Westermann, J. Eg. Arch. 18, 1932, 16 ff.; F. Cumont, Harv. Theol. Rev., 26, 1933, 151 ff.

- (a) the place of meeting is a public temple, and not a private shrine or other building belonging to the association or to a member;
- (b) provision is made, not for an indefinite continuance of the association under a series of presidents, with new members coming in to fill the gaps caused by time, but for its existence during twelve months, under a named president, with no word of new members or of the future;
- (c) the president's assistant is entitled to the obedience of members and he and the president are the only officials.

We shall find parallels for all these features in a group of earlier Ptolemaic texts written in Demotic.

Let us first consider (a).

An association is in general a group which a man joins of his own free will, and which accepts him of its free will, and this mutual acceptance creates certain obligations on both parties. Ancient Greece knew associations which performed public functions in connection with worship (as the *symmories* did in connection with financial liabilities), and others which served private ends. There is little difference of terminology between the two, and the second imitated in various ways the forms of public life, but there is a considerable difference of function. The first were often in close relation to temples even when they had separate buildings of their own.¹²⁵ The second regularly owned their own shrines; *oikos*, which describes such a shrine, is also a frequent term for an association.¹²⁶ If a cult, which thus started in a private way, acquired a public temple, the association might then retain a standing in relation to it, as did the collegium *Isidis* (consisting of *pastophori*) at Rome in the time of Apuleius; it had been founded in the time of Sulla, before the civic temple was built.¹²⁷ In this cult groups

¹²⁵ So the actors' gild (Poland, RE, 5A, 2540 ff.). As an instance of a society serving a public end, cf. the *Iouliastai* who built the heroon for C. Iulius Xenon at Thyateira between 27 and 2 B.C. (Keil-von Premerstein, *Zweite Reisebericht*, no. 74).

¹²⁶ Professor Edgerton draws attention to the fact that the common demotic word for house is often applied to the associations discussed pp. 80 ff. later.

¹²⁷ Apul. Met. 11.30; cf. a college attached to the temple of Hermanubis at Thessalonica (Avezou-Picard, BCH, 37, 1913, 94 ff. no. 6, and the *Σαραπισται*,

commonly had important functions in cultus.¹²⁸ In general, private associations had no such position; occasionally, indeed, they may have tried to get it. An inscription in the new Thesmophorion at the Piraeus of the second half of the fourth century B.C. prohibits the convoking of thiasoi and making of purifications, and also access to the altar, without the consent of the priestess, except at the time of the Thesmophoria and on certain other days on which women come together in accordance with ancestral custom.¹²⁹

A group of citizens with a special devotion to a civic deity or a civic shrine distinguishing them from their fellow citizens is something which does not square with the nature of Greek religion.¹³⁰ The one significant exception is that of the men who had been initiated in a particular mystery and who in some places remained members of a group having a sort of corporate existence and corporate relation to the temple in which the solemn rites were celebrated. Such were the initiates of Dionysus Phleus at Ephesus.¹³¹

gathered by Menneas, who made a dedication in the public Sarapeum at Delos during the Athenian period); (P. Roussel, *Inscriptions de Délos*, 1403; 1417A Col. II 88).

¹²⁸ Cf. N. Papadakis, *Arch. Delt.* 1, 1915, 148 ff.; P. Roussel, *Les cultes égyptiens à Délos*, 270 f.; F. Poland, *RE*, 15, 408 ff.

¹²⁹ Ziehen, *Leges Graecorum sacrae*, 33. (= *IG*, 2, ed. 2, 1343). This prohibition does not occur in other temple regulations, and in the private shrine of Men Tyrannus at Sunium such gatherings were expressly allowed (Ziehen, *ib.*, 49). A Thesmophorion, in view of the secret character of the rites there celebrated probably had special facilities for meetings, and women at least were prone to come together for various religious occasions; cf. Aristophan. *Lys.* 1. In the cult of Dionysus private thiasoi existed in addition to those which had become official; so at Miletus, where there was a prohibition on the gathering of any thiasos before the public thiasos (M. P. Nilsson, in *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni*, 10, 1934, 4).

¹³⁰ Of course individuals as well as groups made benefactions. A text at Gerasa, of 69/70 A.D. is of interest: a porch and a pit were given to Artemis *κυρία* by *οι σεβόμενοι* (C. C. McCown, *Ann. Am. Sch. Or. Res.*, 11, 1933, 134 n. 19); the form of the dedication seems to show Semitic feeling.

¹³¹ Poland 36 ff.; Th. Wiegand, *Ath. Mitt.* 26, 1901, 121 ff. on civically organized mystai at Cyzicus; Cumont, *Am. Journ. Arch.* 37, 1933, 241 n. 9; so also the mystae at Tomi (Ziehen 84), and a similar gild at Philadelphia (Keil-von Premerstein, *Erste Reisebericht*, no. 42). — The kynegoi at Beroea had a special standing in regard to the temple of Heracles, but they were men of a particular

Further, while a mystery shrine had accommodation for meetings (since the ceremonies for which it was built demanded spacious quarters with a variety of rooms), and an Asklepieion had full facilities for the sick to await cures, the ordinary Greek precinct was something different. It was simply a permanent home for an image, an altar or altars, and votive offerings.¹³² Contrast with this the average native precinct in the Near East, which was a complex of buildings, intended on the one hand for communal priestly life and daily ritual, on the other as a goal of pilgrimage on festal occasions, and accordingly equipped with all the facilities of a caravanserai.¹³³ Some at least of its features were reproduced in temples of Oriental gods in the Graeco-Roman world. Thus dining clubs of priests were common in temples in the Semitic area and religious banquets apparently took place in the precincts of the Syrian deities at Rome and elsewhere.¹³⁴ It is not that no one ever ate in a Greek precinct; after private sacrifice it was sometimes obligatory to consume the flesh on the spot (presumably within the precinct):¹³⁵ public banquets were held after sacrifice at certain festivals,¹³⁶ within the Greek area as well as outside it;¹³⁷ and there were *hestiatoria* in or beside precincts to which

rank (C. F. Edson, *Harv. Stud. class. phil.* 45, 1934, 226 ff.). Age groups might be closely related to a temple (e.g. *epheboi*, and CIL, 13, 913 *iuenes a fano Iouis*; among the *Nitiobroges*), but they are so to speak a cross-section of the community.

¹³² S. Wide-M. P. Nilsson, *Griechische u. römische Religion*, ed. 4, 20.

¹³³ Cf. U. Wilcken, *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit*, 1, *passim*, for *katochoi* and others living in the Sarapieion at Memphis, and *ib.*, p. 51 for other *καταλύματα* there, and no. 70 for the strategos spending two days in the Anubieion; J. G. Milne, *J. Eg. Arch.* 11, 1925, 9 for beershop in Sarapieion at Arsinoe; Wilcken, *Festgabe Deissmann*, 10 ff. for strangers lodging in the Metroon at Philadelphia; PSI, 543 (mid. 3rd cent. B.C.), expense account for breakfast in an Iseum; PSI, 1152 (first half 2nd cent. A.D.), *ιστιατόρια* in temple of Seknebtynis at Tebtunis; F. Cumont, *Fouilles de Doura-Europos*, 34, 170; *Suppl. epigr. gr.* 6.839 n. for temple-barbers.

¹³⁴ Cumont, *Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, ed. 4, 256; H. Seyrig, *Syria* 14, 1933, 260 ff. On Sarapic and Isiac meals outside Egypt, cf. P. Roussel, *Les cultes égyptiens à Délos*, 285 n. 5.

¹³⁵ A. Thomsen, *Arch. Rel.*, 12, 1909, 466 ff. More details about the Attic functionaries called *παράσιτοι* would be welcome.

¹³⁶ E.g. at Ephesus and in the shrine for the Ephesian goddess built by Xenophon at Scillus (Ch. Picard, *Ephèse et Claros*, 300 ff.)

¹³⁷ At Panamara (P. Roussel, *BCH*, 51, 1927, 123 ff.).

pilgrims came, as for instance at Olympia, Delos, Lechaion, and in the precinct of Poseidon and Amphitrite on Tenos.¹³⁸ Nevertheless, meetings of the type provided for in our papyrus were almost unknown on Greek soil.¹³⁹

In Egypt, on the other hand, dining clubs met in temples; this applied to societies more definitely secular than ours. The so-called 'couch of Sarapis' was a society nominally dining with the god as its head, but it met in the temples of other deities also, and on occasion in a private house.¹⁴⁰ The temple of Pnepheros at Theadelphia included a 'place of the association of the men who feed the geese.'¹⁴¹ The precinct of Pnepheros and Petesuchos at Karanis had its deipneterion, bearing that name; this was erected in the time of Vespasian, after the dedication of the temple proper in 59/60 A.D.¹⁴² It is possible

¹³⁸ Stengel, RE, 8, 1315; Fiehn, ib. 5A 518; Picard, op. cit. 54; Fr. Studniczka, Das Symposion Ptolemaios II (Abh. sächs. Ges., 30, 1914), 142 f. (two houses next to temple, possibly that of Zeus Aphesios, at Megara, perhaps meant for entertainment of pilgrims), 147 ff. (in area of Hippolytus sanctuary at Troezen); A. Frickenhaus, Arch. Jahrb., 32, 1917, 114 ff. *κατακείμενον* in 1 Cor. 8.10 suggests temples of Syrian or Egyptian deities.

¹³⁹ F. Durrbach, Choix d'inscriptions de Délos, 1, 85, pp. 140 ff. (ca. 153/2 B.C.) is an interesting exception: the *κοινὸν τῶν Τυρίων Ἡρακλειστῶν* met in the temple of Apollo, but that was because they had not yet a shrine of their own, which they subsequently acquired. As a matter of fact, they do not speak of this as a special privilege. Durrbach remarks, p. 143, 'un endroit banal.' Again, at Chytroi in Cyprus three thiasoi sacrificed in the temple of Apollo (M. Ohnefalsch-Richter, Ath. Mitt., 9, 1884, 137). Elsewhere throughout the Greek area there does not seem to be any clear example of the use of a public temple by a private society; apparent exceptions (Poland, 454 f.) belong to societies of the first type, that is to say to groups with a public function, such as the 'worshippers of Zeus who are of those who enter the adyton' at Sardis (Buckler-Robinson, Sardis, VII, 1, 22 pp. 47 ff.; ca. 100 B.C.), and the *koinon* (society of festive reunion) of those who go together to Zeus Hyetios on Cos (Paton-Hicks, Inscriptions of Cos, 382; A. N. Modona, L'isola di Cos nell' antichità classica, 87 n. 8) — or to associations of priests or priestly officials. At Rome certain collegia met on occasion in public temples, but the overwhelming majority had their own shrines and buildings (J. P. Waltzing, Etude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains, 1, 210 f.; San Nicolò, 2, 144).

¹⁴⁰ J. G. Milne, J. Eg. Arch. 11, 1925, 6 ff. W. Otto, Zur Geschichte der Zeit des 6. Ptolemäers (Abh. Munich, N. F. 11, 1934), 16 f.

¹⁴¹ Ev. Breccia, Monuments de l'Egypte gréco-romain, 1, 106 ff. (103/2 B.C.). The politeuma and the Idumaeans from Memphis met in the upper Apollineion, *ἐν τῷ ἄνω Ἀπολλωνιεῶ* (OGI, 737; Otto 1, 128 thinks this an Egyptian temple; was it perhaps Semitic?).

¹⁴² A. E. R. Boak-E. E. Peterson, Karanis 1924/31 (pub. 1933), 41. Cf. ib.,

that the temples derived revenue from having such a room to lease for use; we know that village clubs and the slave club of which we have accounts had to shift around for suitable places,¹⁴³ and in modern times a parish hall has often proved a profitable investment to a church. Some gilds in Egypt had their own shrines and quarters,¹⁴⁴ and we are unable to estimate the relative proportions of the two types of communal life; but, at the same time, the use of structures not belonging to societies is much more prominent than in Greece and was probably predominant in small places.

(b) A Greek or Roman association was commonly formed with the idea that it was to endure forever; it served what appeared to be permanent needs of worship, of union and of mutual benefit. Groupings of this type are known in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt with annual officials who could continue their tenure.¹⁴⁵ This group is established for one year.

(c) Greek associations usually had a multiplicity of officials, and so did many formed in Egypt; ¹⁴⁶ further, when a Greek

35 ff. on houses in the temple-precinct, and 14, two instances of τόπος with the genitive of an occupational name in the North temple. S. Yeivin, *Aegyptus*, 14, 1934, 78 f. suggests that τόπος here denotes the place which these workmen occupied by prescriptive right, like the 'pitch' of a costermonger in London; and Sir Herbert Thompson has in a letter kindly drawn attention to the fact that every large Egyptian temple had its own masons, carpenters, and metalworkers, as well as its bakers, brewers, herdsman, etc. Nevertheless, there may be a meaning 'place of meeting for worship,' for in OGI, 176 (98 B.C.), 178 (95 B.C.), we have the τόπος in the temple of Suchos of men who had passed their ephebeia in a particular year. Cf. SB, 5022 (Theadelphia; late Ptolemaic) *συνόδου νεανίσκων ἐκ τοῦ Ὁσριείου*. For dining rooms cf. also the *ἐστιάτοριον* dedicated to Heron at Theadelphia in 140 B.C. (SB, 6596).

¹⁴³ Westermann, l.c. The society worshipping Augustus at Alexandria met ἐν τῇ Παρατόμῳ (Wilcken, Chr. 112), possibly a public place, as San Nicolò assumes, 2, 145 n. 1.

¹⁴⁴ San Nicolò 2.144 ff.

¹⁴⁵ A priestess of the burial gild of Egyptian women mentioned in a Magdola papyrus of the fourth year of Philopator had held office for four years (O. Guéraud, *ENTETEIEΣ*, 1, pp. 57 f. no. 21); another from Magdola of the first year of Philopator names a priest and an ἀρχιεπιστοῖτης (ib. 53 ff. no. 20); the association of Prammarres (n. 106 above) had a 'priest for life.'

¹⁴⁶ Very often a high priest and a president at the head as in the club worshipping Augustus (Wilcken, Chr. 112, *synagogeus kai prostates*, priest, and *gymnasiarch*); compare a contemporary women's club, — *ονιακῇ γυναικῇ* [*συνόδῳ*], perhaps as the editor suggests, Ἀπολλωνιακῇ, at Alexandria (C. C. Edgar, *J. Eg. Arch.*

association had a *ὑπὸνέτης*, he was in a strictly subordinate capacity.¹⁴⁷ Here he is a second in command.

All these peculiarities appear also in a group of Demotic texts ranging from 223 B.C. to 137/6 B.C., which preserve records of associations serving religious and social ends. The oldest which we have is a papyrus from a tomb at Medinet Ghôran of 223 B.C. which describes itself as a text of the regulations which the members of the association of the temple of Horus-Behoudti in the city-of-Souchos Pissai (?), of the district of Themistes, on the South bank of the canal Moeris in the Arsinoite nome, have undertaken to observe. They promise to furnish portions of salt, unguent, garlands, vases of lustral water, flowers of conyza, and beer or wine, and to sit in the temple on agreed days from the twenty-fourth year in Mechir till the twenty-fifth year, end of Tybi, or $12\frac{1}{6}$ months, or a year, in addition to the festival days on which the members shall agree to sit. When they meet, they are to do sacrifice for Ptolemy, Arsinoe, the Theoi Adelphoi, the Theoi Euergetai . . . for all the gods of Egypt included in the association. Further regulations deal with monthly dues, with fines for conduct contrary to the law of the society (e.g. adultery with a member's wife or false accusations of leprosy), with attendance at processions of the falcon, in which they are to accompany the 'Superior of the falcon' and the other Superiors of the corporation to the tomb of the falcon, with the giving of food and assistance to members thrown into prison or having gone into temples as penitents or recluses, with contributions for mourning and embalming, and with consolation in bereavement.¹⁴⁸

We have from Tebtunis a series of regulations, made in each

4, 1917, 253 f.); for an earlier Greek association with various officers, cf. Wilcken, UPZ, 1, 438 f. An unpublished Rylands papyrus, perhaps of the time of Augustus, mentions the prostates and grammeteus of a funerary club of fellow-soldiers.

¹⁴⁷ Apart from the use of *ὑπὸνέται* for a class of initiates in two new Mithraic inscriptions from Rome discussed by F. Cumont, Rev. Hist. rel. 109, 1934, 63 ff. The Iobacchi had an *ἀνθιερέως* as well as a *ιερέως* (SIG, 1109). On the meaning of *ὑπὸνέτης* in the papyri cf. B. T. Holmes, J. Bibl. Lit., 54, 1935, 64 ff.

¹⁴⁸ H. Sottas, Papyrus démotiques de Lille, 1, pp. 57 ff. no. 29. We may note in passing that from the first century A.D. we find Greek cities voting decrees of

case for one year, by cult associations between 180/79 and 137/6 B.C.¹⁴⁹ The meeting place is always a precinct; in no. 30619, dating from 138/7 B.C. there are different temples for different occasions. Each begins 'the law (like our νόμος δν . .) on which the people of the society and the priests of the holy crocodile have agreed, saying, we will do it from — of the year x till — of the year x + 1, which makes a year. We will assemble before Suchos on feast days. We will give our contributions on feast days, paying them to our president; if any man do not pay, the president shall take security and shall make the man pay a fine in addition. We will make the libations and burnt offerings for their majesties (Ptolemaios and Kleopatra . . .) together with the libations and burnt offerings for various deities. We will accompany the Suchos deities to their burial as heretofore.' There follow provisions for mutual aid as in the previous text.¹⁵⁰

Such a society, while nominally meeting for one year, might reconstitute itself with indefinite frequency. The membership list for 158/7 is fragmentary; of nine names preserved two possibly recur among the thirty-two of 157/6 but difficulties of reading make any conclusions uncertain. What seems more important is that no. 30618, which belongs to the society whose law is preserved in no. 30619, gives accounts extending over more than nineteen months. This suggests that the society of the second of the two years was thought of as possessing effective continuity with that of the first. But Professor Edgerton, while agreeing that the society probably possessed effective

consolation (SIG, 866 and note) — perhaps an indication of an increasing trend towards human sympathy.

¹⁴⁹ W. Spiegelberg, *Die demotischen Papyrus*, (Cat. Cairo, 39) pp. 18 ff. no. 30605 (157/6 B.C.); 26 ff. no. 30606 (158/7); 290 ff. no. 31179 (148/7); 66 ff. no. 30619 a + b (138/7); 61 ff. no. 30618 (accounts only: 138/6); 286 ff. no. 31178 (180/79). A Ptolemaic fragment from Pathyris (Gebelén), p. 94, no. 30654 is too short to afford data.

¹⁵⁰ There are fines for non-attendance and for failure, unless excused for sickness, to bring an offering on feast days; attendance at funerals is required; the president is to help if a man becomes a temple-prisoner; help is to be given to members involved in difficult cases at law. There are variations in detail, apart from those in the selection of deities listed, e.g. the ordinance of 138/7 names the days on which temples are to be attended.

tive continuity, remarks that the document is in such confusion that some degree of caution may be advisable and that the use of the same account book implies at most that whoever kept the accounts of the first society performed the same functions in the second; also, the blank page in the account book was too valuable to be thrown away. Possibly there was at times immediate succession of these annual formations, at times not.¹⁵¹ Nevertheless, such a club was in a different position from one constituted for indefinite duration. It is hard to see any way in which it could have owned property, and in fact all funds passed through its president's hands.

In some, but not in all the Demotic texts, the priests are mentioned as a separate entity combining with that of the lay members; but there were priestly members in all of the associations in question. The lists group (1) the priests, (2) lay members, (3) 'the youths,' or just (2) and (3).¹⁵² There is very close agreement in the offences for which penalties are prescribed, and close agreement in the penalties and in the amount of the contributions; this applies also to the scanty Greek fragments of the record of a society at Magdola in Ptolemaic times.¹⁵³

¹⁵¹ The association formed in 158/7 was to last till the month of Mesore, that of 157/6 was to commence on the second of Mesore and continue till Mesore 8 of the next year. At the same time, as between 148/7 and 138/7, we find the opening day shifting from Thot to the fifteenth of Pharmouthi, which is a greater gap than is to be expected from a slight running over the 365 days; perhaps there was some discontinuity; and there are slight differences in the law of 138/7. An association at Tebtunis has a 'president of the fifth year'; P. Mich. Tebt. 127, I, 20 ἡγο(υμένω) (πέμπτον) (ἔτους) συνόδο(ν) θεοῦ. The year is not regnal, for it was the sixth year of Claudius, and the expression perhaps implies that the association started on an annual basis and decided to continue as it was; but it might be loose phrasing for ἐπ' ἔτη πέντε. In P. Mich. Inv. 1277, the law of the freedmen's guild at Tebtunis under Claudius, a ἡγούμενος is chosen for a year; but the group had some effective continuity of existence, for we read in I. 2 κληθέντες ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτῷ (for -δ) ὁ (for οἱ) οἰπογεγραμμένοι (for ὑπογ.) ἄνδρες: some one had called them together.

¹⁵² Listed (not separately) with other names but not initially mentioned in the text of 138/7; initially mentioned but not separately listed in that of 180/79. The society of Hathor established before Agathodaemon by Harm-esen, the son of Peteharsomtus, the lesonis priest, and the folk of the cult society together (Spiegelberg, Dem. Denkm., 3, p. 2 no. 50024) illustrates priestly participation in 6 B.C. at Dendera. Cf. Spiegelberg, Z. äg. Spr., 42, 1905, 43 ff. (text relating to a weavers' association, 250/100 B.C., in which was a lesonis priest).

¹⁵³ Sottas 70 ff.; the Greek text is reprinted in SB, 6319; here no one of the members is described as having priestly functions.

All these societies met in temples, met for a year and had a president; all the Tebtunis texts save that of 180/79 had a deputy president, commonly called 'the second.'¹⁵⁴ How did this institution arise? and how did it acquire such remarkable fixity?¹⁵⁵ The question cannot be answered with any approximation to certainty till we have much more abundant material for Egyptian social and religious life between the decline of the New Kingdom and the advent of Alexander.

We can, however, point to certain facts which may well have a bearing on this development. First, the temples were the most important public buildings and in a high degree centres of communities. Secondly, the priesthood contained a great variety of grades, shading off from dignitaries to men of no consequence: in the Gnomon of the Idios Logos or Roman regulations for one area of public finance, *pastophoroi* were allowed to hold 'laymen's positions' which were not open to the priests.¹⁵⁶ There seems to have been an almost sharper differentiation between the higher clergy and the lower clergy than between the lower clergy and the laity. The Gnomon represents the rigid practice of the Romans, but it is likely that they developed existing tendencies. According to it *pastophoroi* were not allowed to make processions or to seize priestly positions, and those who buried sacred animals were ineligible for the office of prophet and for carrying shrines and feeding sacred animals. At the same time, prophets were forbidden and *pastophoroi* were permitted to taste offerings from a *kline* (i.e., a dining club meeting in a temple). There is evidence of conflict between *pastophoroi* and priests,¹⁵⁷ and the

¹⁵⁴ Cf. San Nicolò 2, 56 f.; 1, 169 n. 5; 2, 77 f. (on the *βοηθοί* collecting taxes and the influence of administrative institutions. So at Memphis the epistates of the temple, the high priest, and the head of the *pastophoroi*, each had a deputy; Wilcken, UPZ, 1 pp. 44 ff.).

¹⁵⁵ The annual basis remains unexplained; for the point of departure each year is neither the named festival nor the first day of the year or of the month (themselves celebrated in temple; A. Erman, *Die Religion der Ägypten*, 1934 ed., 179 f.).

¹⁵⁶ P. M. Meyer, *Juristische Papyri*, p. 339; cf. M. Rostovtzeff, *Gnomon*, 11, 1935, 528.

¹⁵⁷ PSI 1149, a memorial from the temple of Seknebtynis at Tebtunis to the prefect of Egypt or the high priest of Alexandria: the *pastophoroi* claimed *την*

records of the second century B.C. from the Sarapeum at Memphis show a katochos performing functions in connection with the pastophoroi.¹⁵⁸ The laity were distinct; they were the *ιδιώται* who lacked the financial rights which characterized the lower clergy as much as the higher clergy, but socially they approximated to them. Thirdly, the men who performed minor religious offices, whether for the cult of the dead or for the care of sacred animals, formed associations connected with the temples, perhaps with the desire of having a social solidarity comparable with that of the courses of priests called in Greek times *phylai*.¹⁵⁹ Fourthly, organized lay participation in temple worship was an ancient custom; a crowd took part in the ceremonial combat at Busiris or uttered its acclamations in other dramatic worship;¹⁶⁰ and a rise in popular self-consciousness has been seen in the Middle Kingdom.¹⁶¹ A text mentioning the Pharaoh Hakoris, possibly belonging to his reign (ca. 390-78 B.C.) and on palaeographical grounds capable of being

παραφυλακὴν ποιέεισθαι πάντων τῶν ἐντὸς [τοῦ? περὶ] βόλου τῶν ἱερῶν (cf. Horapollon 1.41 where the hieroglyph for *παστοφόρος* is explained *διὰ τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦτου φυλάττεσθαι τὸ ἱερόν*).

¹⁵⁸ U. Wilcken, UPZ, 1, pp. 381 ff., 438 f.

¹⁵⁹ On this aspect of the *χοαχῦται* cf. U. Wilcken, UPZ, 2 p. 38 and his reference to the gild of Amon of Opet. In general cf. Otto, 1, 95 ff.; for the thiasos at Ombos concerned with burying the sacred birds cf. Fr. Preisigke — W. Spiegelberg, Die Prinz Joachim Ostraka (Schr. Wiss. Ges. Strassburg, 19, 1914) and H. Sottas, Rev. Arch. 5th ser., 13, 1921, 24 ff.; for the *isionomoi*, Otto, 2, 73, 175, 196, and C. C. Edgar, Bull. Ryl. Libr., 18, 1934, 128, no. 16; for 'the pious servants of Hapi-Osiris (the later Sarapis) the great god' — perhaps a sodality — on a stele of the 24th year of Darius, probably from the Sarapieion at Sakkara, cf. Spiegelberg, Demot. Denkmäler, 3, p. 13, no. 50042.

¹⁶⁰ The cry *εὐρήκαμεν, συγχαίρομεν* made a deep impression on the Roman world; for Busiris, cf. Herodot. 2. 61. To avoid misunderstanding, it should be stated that from of old private persons made offerings of food and drink; A. M. Blackman, Encycl. Rel. Eth., 12, 780; G. Lefebvre, Le Tombeau de Petosiris, 1, 150 'tout haut fonctionnaire, tout prêtre, tout prophète, tout officiant, tout homme qui entrera dans cette nécropole pour faire des sacrifices aux esprits supérieurs'; Otto, 1.392 ff. The permission in the Gnomon of the Idios Logos for *ιδιώται*, laymen, to take part in a procession in Greek temples may imply a prohibition at that time or their so doing in Egyptian temples, unless a confraternity was privileged, though it need do no more than attend. For lay functions in connexion with a temple cf. the (perhaps military) society of the 2nd century B.C. made known by U. Wilcken, P. Würzburg, no. 4, pp. 37 ff.

¹⁶¹ A. Moret, Recueil Champollion, 331 ff.

assigned to the fourth century B.C., gives some regulations of a gild of men who were bound to attend one another's funerals and who had something to do with making 'the blessings of its living Apis, the great god'; its fragmentary opening includes the phrase 'Twelve months, that is one year [again?]' ; there were monthly contributions of money; a fragmentary passage may refer to mutual assistance in law suits.¹⁶² Again, workers in the Theban metropolis belonged to a gild devoted to Amenophis I, perhaps founded by him. They celebrated his festival, drinking before him for four full days with their wives and children.¹⁶³

So we have in our papyrus an Egyptian form of organisation. The closest Greek analogies are to be found in the *eranos* or society of men contributing for a common purpose and in the symposion of men who met — often on a contributory basis¹⁶⁴ — to make libations and to drink,¹⁶⁵ and who accordingly submitted to the rule of a president selected by themselves for that purpose; they thus secured the orderliness demanded by the solemnity of sharing cup and hymn. This habit is illustrated in Egypt by a poem found at Elephantine in a private copy of about 280 B.C., together with lyrical fragments possibly intended

¹⁶² Formerly in the possession of Monsieur S. de Ricci, and now, as he courteously informs us, in the Bibliothèque de l'Institut de France. The text was mentioned by Spiegelberg, *Die sogenannte demotische Chronik* (Dem. Stud. 7, 1914), 30. Professor W. F. Edgerton has kindly made available a provisional translation based on Spiegelberg's photograph and transcription.

¹⁶³ J. Černý, *Bull. inst. franç.*, 27, 1927, 159 ff. Professor W. F. Edgerton draws attention to a doubtful confraternity for which G. Legrain argues, *Ann. Serv. Ant. Eg.*, 8, 1907, 254 ff. Sethe's suggestion (ap. F. Ll. Griffith, *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, 31, 1909, 290) that the Dodgson papyrus refers to a sect of Osirians who cast out an unworthy member does not seem convincing. On native religious associations in Egypt cf. also A. Wiedemann, *Arch. Rel.*, 13, 1910, 360 f.; 17, 1914, 216 f.; *Woch. klass. Phil.*, 1913, 822 f.

¹⁶⁴ Ephipp. ap. Athen. 13 p. 572C. and Aeschin. 1.75 treat the habit of drinking without paying one's scot as associated with unnatural vice. For habitual drinking together, cf. Poland, *RE*, 4A, 1075 ff.; on the development of private groups so meeting in the fourth century B.C., cf. M. P. Nilsson, *Symbolae Danielsson*, 218 ff.

¹⁶⁵ Sometimes also for the meal which preceded the symposion proper; cf. J. Martin, *Das Symposion* (Stud. Gesch. Kult. Alt. 17, 1/2, 1931), 149 ff. Private persons often made private celebrations of recognized public festivals, as we do of Christmas (cf. C. C. Edgar, *Bull. Ryl. Libr.*, 18, 1934, 127 no. 15 for the *Hermaia*; P. Col. Zen. 19 for the *Thesmophoria*; L. Deubner, *Attische Feste*, 156, for the *Diasia* at Athens; and above all OGI, 90.52).

to serve as *scolia*. The poem professes to be the speech of the president exhorting the group to good fellowship tempered by obedience. The lyric in its turn includes (1.9) *σῆμαινε*, a request to the president to order silence, and the exclamation, *εὖ*, Well.¹⁶⁶ It has been suggested that the poems were copied out for the use of a group of soldiers among those stationed at Elephantine. This may be so, but it is a literary production.

In any case, the differences of such a group from ours are manifest. A Greek convivial meeting might have considerable stability of membership and might be bound to a stated day, such as the twentieth, but its ordinances varied from president to president and evening to evening; it did not bear a religious title, did not have a basis in the life of the community, and did not meet in a temple. The Hellenic type of meeting did in fact obtain some considerable vogue in Egypt, appearing in the dining *thiasoi* of which we have accounts, and the village associations are related to it.¹⁶⁷ We can see the influence of this secularizing trend in our papyrus. After all, Zeus Hypsistos plays a curiously small part. The society is named after him and meets in his temple, and that is all we hear of him in as much of the text as is preserved. Presumably the libations and prayers¹⁶⁸ were addressed to him, but 'for the king' is all that is explicit. Of course, our text is an abridgment, but even so it gives us the perspective of a member. We have, of course, only part; in what is lost there may well have been regulations about mutual aid and other duties, corresponding to those which we find in the Demotic texts.

The Pharaohs had always had a central position in the religion of Egypt; the Ptolemies maintained, increased, and systematized this ascendancy. They showed profound respect

¹⁶⁶ Wilamowitz-Schubart, Berl. Kl. T. 5, 2, 62 f., a reference due to Professor Schubart.

¹⁶⁷ Cf. W. L. Westermann, J. Eg. Arch. 18, 1932, 16 ff. For dining clubs cf. San Nicolò 1, 14, adding J. G. Tait, Ostraka 1, p. 52 no. 312 (late 3rd cent. B.C.), 49 no. 295 and 53 no. 322 (both 1st B.C.), SB, 6668 (209 B.C.; Kôm Saggari); also a *kleinarches* from Memnonia in Tait, 137 no. 372 (no date); ib. nos. 369-71, wine accounts, possibly of a sodality; (nos. 370-1 are 2nd/3rd A.D.).

¹⁶⁸ Sacrifice may well be covered by the phrase *καὶ τὰλλα τὰ νομιζόμενα* (9-10; note ad loc.), but it was perhaps omitted; it involved payment of the tax levied on victims sacrificed as well as on incense (W. Schwahn, RE, 5A, 292).

for the temples, but they were realists; an edict of Euergetes II speaks of the byssusworkers, who are to 'use their implements in temples for the service of the sovereigns and the vestments of the other gods.'¹⁶⁹ The brilliance of the temples had become largely a matter of façade. Not a few may have felt like the writer of *Corpus Hermeticum* 4, 7, who says of men who choose bodily things that 'just as processions pass through our midst, not able to achieve anything, but getting in the way of some people, so these men do but move in a processional way through the world, being escorted by bodily pleasures.'

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The prohibitions in this as in other texts relating to ancient clubs indicate the perils which threatened table-fellowship and illustrate the disorders of the Corinthian Eucharist.¹⁷⁰ This document is of particular significance as showing how an Egyptian mode of corporate life passed from the native-speaking to the Greek-speaking and met the demands of piety, of loyalty, of good fellowship, and of local pride; it shows also the advance of secularization. It comes from an age of transition. The Greek element had, it seems, in the main lost its virtue; the Egyptian had reasserted itself since 217 B.C., but had no leadership. Cleopatra might have united Greek and Egyptian;¹⁷¹ after Actium there weighed on both alike the heavy yoke of Roman rule which must needs make the government of Egypt pay. It was reserved for the bishops of Alexandria and the monks of the desert to make a new unity.¹⁷²

¹⁶⁹ P. Tebt. 5, 245 ff. (118 B.C.). — Even in the Demotic texts (p. 80 above) royalty comes before the gods, — as in a Roman military dedication at Lambaesis, CIL, 8, 2554.

¹⁷⁰ Lucian, Concerning the death of Peregrinus, 11 speaks of Christ as *θιασάρχης καὶ ξυναγωγεύς*. For Corinth we may note that, according to Hermias ap. Athen. 4 p. 149F, in the three sacred annual dinners of the men of Naucratis (p. 49 above) certain food and drink were given to all in the prytaneion, and those eating there were not allowed to bring in any eatables from outside.

¹⁷¹ Cf. W. W. Tarn, *Camb. Anc. Hist.*, 10, 35 ff.

¹⁷² Not without its rifts; cf. E. Schwartz, *Abh. Munich*, N. F. 10, 1934, 199.

ADDENDA

P. 57. Another dedication from Gumasovo in the region of Serdica to Zeus Hypsistos, by a Thracian who also made two dedications *κυρίῳ Διὶ*; G. Kazanrow, *Arch. Anz.* 1927, 335 no. 9.

For a private shrine to Zeus Hypsistos, shared by the Dioscuri, in Moesia Inferior, cf. E. Kalinka, *Ant. Denkm. aus Bulgarien*, no. 133.

P. 58. At Tieion, on the borders of Bithynia, Paphlagonia, and Pontus, L. Robert has found an unpublished votive inscription to *θεὸς ὑψιστος* (W. Ruge, *RE*, 6A, 861).

As for Gerizim, R. P. Casey in Jackson-Lake, *Beginnings of Christianity*, 5, 153 n., remarks on the unconvincing nature of the Greek literary evidence. Nevertheless, the temple shown on the coins of Neapolis from the time of Antoninus Pius must have been pagan. We cannot prove that the title Zeus Hypsistos was used; but of all titles acceptable to a Greek it was the one which would best have preserved continuity. I am not competent to judge the value of the Samaritan tradition concerning Hadrian quoted by Cook 888.

P. 60. For pairs of identical ex-votos, cf. G. Seure, *Rev. ét. anc.* 26, 1924, 30 n. 5.

P. 62 n. 56. But *κορυφαῖος*, though associated with mountains, does not necessarily refer to them; cf. A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, 2, 869 and *Ann. épigr.* 1934, no. 79 (232 A. D.: from Lanišče near Ljubljana) *deae Corypheaē siue Caelesti Aug.*

P. 66. But Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* 16. 163 quotes from an ordinance of Augustus to the province of Asia *καθὼς ἐχρῶντο ἐπὶ Ὑρκανοῦ ἀρχιερέως θεοῦ ὑψίστου*, and according to Stauffer in *Kittel, Theol. Wbch.*, 3. 115, this is the only instance of *ὑψιστος* so used in Josephus. Accordingly, if the wording is due to Augustus, he was being as complimentary to the Jews as possible; the alternative would have been *τοῦ αὐτῶν θεοῦ*. Cf. Schürer, *SB. Berlin*, 1897, 215.

P. 84. For lay participation, cf. A. H. Gardiner, *Hieratic Papyri in the B. M., Third Series*, Chester Beatty Gift, 1, 91 f. (hymns to be sung daily by the general public congregated in the outer halls of the temple).

NOTES

THE MEANING OF ΠΟΛΙΤΕΤΤΑΙ IN JUSTIN, i Apol. 65. 1

JUSTIN's first Apology (65. 1) reads: ὅπως καταξιωθῶμεν τὰ ἀληθῆ μαθόντες καὶ δι' ἔργων ἀγαθοὶ πολιτευταὶ καὶ φύλακες τῶν ἐντεταλμένων εὐρεθῆναι, ὅπως τὴν αἰώνιον σωτηρίαν σωθῶμεν. In the usual interpretation of this sentence I find that a difficulty has been rather easily overlooked. It has been taken for granted, without further investigation, that πολιτευταὶ is a synonym for πολῖται and is one of those words the use of which became broadened in the post-classical period. The word, however, does not occur in classical Greek, and I cannot find a single reference in Christian or other literature to substantiate this assumed 'broad' significance of the term. Hence I hesitate to apply it to this passage in Justin. The few references to the word in Christian literature indicate its technical meaning of *decurio* — a magistrate of a city or colony. This is a sense borne out by the Lexicon of Moeris (Moeridis Atticistae Lexicon, 1759, p. 325), where the word is given as the equivalent of the Attic δημαγωγός. The same idea is suggested by the use of πολιτευόμενος for *decurio* in the papyri (for examples see Moulton and Milligan, Vocab. of N. T. Greek, under πολιτεύομαι).

The word πολιτευτής occurs in Eusebius (Vita Constantini 3. 1, Migne P. G. XX, 1056 A) in the phrase δῆμων καὶ πολιτευτῶν ἀνδρῶν. Most commentators, including Valesius, have taken this as 'people and magistrates (*decuriones*),' though E. C. Richardson (Post Nicene Fathers, Second Series, vol. 1, ad loc.) suggests *peregrini et cives*, but he cites no evidence to support his position. Further examples of the word to mean magistrate or *decurio* can be found in Athanasius (Migne P. G. XXV, 729 A) and in Gregory Naz. (Migne P. G. XXXVII, 241 B). This last reference (in the 49th Epistle — ad Olympium) reads: πάντας πολίτας τε καὶ πολιτευτὰς καὶ ἀξιωματικούς. The contrast with πολίτης should prevent a too hasty assumption that the words are synonyms in Justin. The antecedent probability, therefore, is that the word means magistrate or administrator in the passage under consideration.

When we turn to the interpretation of the passage, we find that the general tendency has been to assume the underlying idea is that of 'good citizenship,' in the sense of Phil. 1. 27 and 3. 20, where the broad use of πολιτεύομαι and πολίτευμα appears. Instances of this idea in Justin do occur several times (cf. his use of πολιτεία in i Apol. 4. 2, and the phrase πολιτευσάμενους κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως, Dial. 45. 3). We

give now some examples of this interpretation of our passage. Kaye, J. (Apology of Justin Martyr, 1930, ad loc.) translates by, 'that our conversation might be as becometh the Gospel and that we may be found doers of the word.' E. A. Sophocles (Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods) renders, 'liver, one that lives . . . ἀγαθός, of good conduct,' and similarly A. W. F. Blunt suggests 'good liver' (The Apologies of Justin Martyr, 1911, p. 97, n. 19). In the same way German and French scholars all incline to this meaning: G. Rauschen (Bib. der Kirchenväter. Früchr. Apolog. Band 1. 1913) 'als tüchtige Mitglieder der Gemeinde und als Beobachter der Gebote'; L. Pautigny (Justin Apologies 1904) 'de pratiquer la vertu et de garder les commandements.' The editor (D. Prudentius Maranus) in Migne (P. G. VI. 467 A) renders into Latin, *ut rectam operibus vitam agentes et praeceptorum custodes inveniamur*. Otto (Corpus Apolog. Christ. 3rd. ed. 1876, vol. I, p. 178, n. 3) suggests a corruption of ἀγαθῶν πολιτευσθαι, but translates, *ut rectam operibus agentes et mandatorum observatores inveniamur*.

I would venture the suggestion that the usual meaning of πολιτευταί (magistrates, administrators of law) be preserved, and that the word be taken in close conjunction with φύλακες, so that τῶν ἐντεταλμένων can be referred to both nouns. I would thus render the passage: 'that, now we have learned the truth, we may be counted worthy even through our deeds to be good administrators and good observers of the commandments.'

This administration of the laws might refer to the sacraments, with which our author here deals, or (in a disciplinary sense) to the more general moral laws of Christ, but in either case this meaning of πολιτευταί (the only one we find in the literature of the period) is fitting and it seems quite unnecessary to make the unwarranted assumption that the word is a synonym of πολίτης. The idea Justin has in mind seems to be that the Christian community is responsible for seeing that the laws of Christ are put into practice within the fellowship. This disciplinary function of the community occurs several times in Justin (e.g. such phrases as, τούτων ἀλλήλους ἀναμνησκόμεν . . . καὶ σύνεσμεν ἀλλήλους, i Apol. 67. 1,¹ and cf. Tertullian Apol. 39. 1, *corpus sumus* . . . *de disciplinae unitate* — of the Christian community).

¹ These words of Justin (cf. i Apol. 67. 4) are certainly to be taken in connection with ethics, as they are immediately followed by a reference to charity. There do not seem to be any direct references in Justin to the actual exercise of discipline in the community, for his motive in writing is apologetic. He is making out a case for the moral goodness of the Christian community, and assumes that the only exercise of discipline necessary is one of mutual exhortation.

A second meaning of *φύλακες* is also possible. Justin does indeed use the word elsewhere in the above sense of 'observers of law' (cf. Dial. 96, *φύλαξ τῶν παραδεδομένων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ διδαγμάτων* — where the context clearly shows the reference is to the keeping of the law). In our passage, however, the idea of the Christians being the 'guardians of the laws' (cf. Plato, Legg. 966 B and Philo De. Spec. Leg. 4. 2 [Cohn. 5. 211. 12], *φύλακες τῶν νόμων*) is not altogether excluded. Justin's idea might be that the members of the Christian community were both the administrators of the laws as well as the wardens of them (for this sense of *φύλαξ*, as guardian, in Justin see i Apol. 2. 2; 9. 5). Nevertheless, in view of the concluding phrase, *ὅπως τὴν αἰώνιον σωτηρίαν σωθῶμεν*, I would prefer my first rendering (cf. i Apol. 8. 2; 12. 1; 14. 3; 66. 1 etc.).

CYRIL C. RICHARDSON

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BOOKS RECEIVED

- AMERICAN ACADEMY FOR JEWISH RESEARCH. Proceedings, Vol. VI, 1934-35. Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society, 1935. Pp. 377.
- AMERICAN PHILOSOPHY TODAY AND TOMORROW. Edited by Horace M. Kallen and Sidney Hook. New York, Lee Furman, Inc., 1935. Pp. viii, 519. \$3.75.
- THE ANNUAL OF THE AMERICAN SCHOOLS OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH. Vol. XV for 1934-35. Edited by Millar Burrows and E. A. Speiser. New Haven, American Schools of Oriental Research, 1935. Pp. 202. \$2.50.
- ARCHBISHOPS' COMMISSION ON THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN. Report. London, The Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly, 1935. Pp. 90. 1 shilling.
- ARCHIVUM FRATRUM PRAEDICATORUM. Vol. V, 1935. Istituto Storico Domenicano, Santa Sabina, Roma. Pp. 410.
- THE BEACON SONG AND SERVICE BOOK; for Children and Young People. Boston, The Beacon Press, Inc., 1935. Pp. xx, 294. \$1.00.
- CHRIST IN RECENT ART. Sixteen Pictures by Artists of international Repute. A fresh and modern Appraisal of spiritual Values. Picture Interpretations by Albert Edward Bailey. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935. 50 cents.
- FAITH AND REASON; the Conflict over the Rationalism of Maimonides. By Joseph Sarachek. Vol. I. Oriental series. Williamsport, Bayard Press, 1935. Pp. xiv, 285.
- THE FRANCISCAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE. Report of the seventeenth annual Meeting, Garrison, N. Y., July 1-3, 1935.
- FROM DYAD TO TRIAD. A Plea for Duality against Dualism and an Essay towards the Synthesis of Orthodoxy. By Alexis van der Mensbrugghe. London, The Faith Press, 1935. Pp. xxi, 153. 7s. 6d.
- GOSPEL ACCORDING TO IM-ANU-EL. Abbey of Immanuel, South Whitley, Indiana, 1933. Pp. 79. \$1.00.
- DER GRIECHISCH-LATEINISCHE TEXT DES GALATERBRIEFES IN DER HANDSCHRIFTENGROPPE D E F G. Karl Th. Schäfer. Sonderdruck aus Scientia Sacra, 1935.
- HEBREW UNION COLLEGE ANNUAL. Vol. X. Cincinnati, 1935. Pp. 597. \$2.00.
- THE HISTORICAL SCHOLARSHIP OF SAINT BELLARMIN. By E. A. Ryan, S.J. New York, The Fordham University Press, 1936. Pp. xiv, 226.
- A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN EPISCOPAL CHURCH. By William Wilson Manross. New York, Morehouse Publishing Co., 1935. Pp. xvi, 404. \$2.75.
- JEWISH STUDIES in memory of George A. Kohut, 1874-1933. Edited by Salo W. Baron and Alexander Marx. New York, The Alexander Kohut memorial foundation, 1935. Pp. xciii, 614, 148. \$7.50.
- LECTURES ON THE KINGDOM OF GOD IN JAPAN. By C. Burnell Olds. Cleveland, Ohio, C. B. Olds, Jr., 1936. Pp. 64. 40 cents.

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

- THE LETTER OF ARISTEAS; a linguistic Study with special Reference to the Greek Bible. *By Henry G. Meecham.* Publications of the University of Manchester, No. CCXLI. Manchester University Press, 1935. Pp. xxi, 355. 12s. 6d.
- LA LITTÉRATURE QUODLIBÉTIQUE. II. *Par P. Glorieux.* Bibliothèque Thomiste, XXI. Paris, J. Vrin, 1935. Pp. 387. 40 francs.
- LUTHER-JAHRBUCH, 1935. *Jahrbuch der Luther-gesellschaft hrsg. von Th. Knolle.* München, Chr. Kaiser. Pp. 176. 7.50 marks.
- DIE MAKABÄER. Eine Darstellung ihrer Geschichte von den Anfängen bis zum Untergang des Hasmonäerhauses. *Von Elias Bickermann.* Berlin, Schocken Verlag, 1935. Pp. 77.
- THE MIND OF PAUL. *By Irwin Edman.* Studies in Religion and Culture. Schermerhorn Lecture III. New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1935. Pp. 187. \$1.75.
- POLARITY; a German Catholic's Interpretation of Religion. *By Erich Przywara. Translated by A. C. Bouquet.* London, Oxford University Press, Milford, 1935. Pp. xii, 150. Price, New York, \$3.00.
- RELIGION AND SCIENCE. *By Bertrand Russell.* New York, Henry Holt and Co., 1935. Pp. 271. \$2.00.
- RELIGION OF REASON. Hermann Cohen's System of Religious Philosophy. *By Trude Weiss Rosmarin.* New York, Bloch Publishing Co., 1936. Pp. xi, 195. \$2.50.
- REPORT OF THE ARCHBISHOPS' COMMISSION ON THE RELATIONS OF CHURCH AND STATE. Official summary. 1936.
- TEOLOGIA libro primo. *Tommaso Campanella.* Edizione critica con Introduzione, Appendici e una Tavola. A Cura di Romano Amerio. Orbis Romanus VII. Milano, Società Editrice 'Vita e Pensiero,' 1936. Pp. xxxvi, 463. 40 lire.
- HET TESTIMONIABOEK: Studiën over O. T. Citaten in het N. T. en bij de Patres, met critische Beschouwingen over de Theorieën van J. Rendel Harris en D. Plooy. *Door N. J. Hommes.* Amsterdam, N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-Maatschappij, 1935. Pp. 393. 4.90 florins.